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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are preparing a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego, California. FTA is serving as lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and SANDAG is serving as lead agency for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Draft SEIS/SEIR will build upon and update previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decisions for the Mid-Coast Corridor. These include:

- Adoption, in 1995, of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) – an 11-mile extension of the Trolley light rail transit (LRT) system from the Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) to University City.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the first portion of the LPA extending from OTTC to Balboa Avenue completed in June 2001.
- An update to the 1995 LPA alignment, adopted in December 2003, to serve the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus on both the sides of Interstate 5 (I-5) and to connect the Trolley with the University Towne Centre (UTC) Transit Center.
- Inclusion of the project in the extension of TransNet half-cent sales tax for transportation projects, approved by voters in November 2004.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR will include an analysis of changed conditions in the Mid-Coast Corridor since the previous environmental studies were completed.

The Mid-Coast Corridor LRT Project is included in the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (RTP) (SANDAG 2007) under both the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios. TransNet will provide 50 percent of the project’s capital cost, with the remaining 50 percent assumed to come from the FTA Section 5309 New Starts program. Securing these funds will require successfully completing the FTA New Starts requirements.

1.1 Project History and Background

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project was first identified as a transit project in 1987 when voters approved Proposition A, the county’s half-cent transportation sales tax measure (TransNet). In 1991, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) began planning studies and environmental review for the corridor in accordance with the FTA Alternatives Analysis process for New Starts, NEPA, and CEQA.
The AA/DEIS/DEIR, which evaluated a full range of reasonable alternatives, was completed in February 1995. In October 1995, MTDB certified the EIR and adopted an LPA to extend the existing Trolley LRT system from OTTC north to University City.

After completing the FEIR, MTDB elected to divide the project into two separate sections or phases for implementation. The first phase would have extended from Old Town to Balboa Avenue (Balboa Extension) and the second phase would have extended from Balboa Avenue to University City (University City Extension). In September 1996, FTA approved the initiation of preliminary engineering for the first phase. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the first phase was completed in June 2001, and FTA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in August 2001.

Between 1999 and 2003, MTDB evaluated and considered various alignment options and modes for the University City Extension. This effort was made in response to new development occurring in the area and a renewed desire to better connect with the UCSD campus and the UTC Transit Center. In February 2003, MTDB reaffirmed its strategy of pursuing the Mid-Coast Project LPA as an LRT project.

In July 2003, as a result of state legislation, all MTDB planning, programming, project development, and construction functions were transferred to SANDAG. SANDAG is also designated as the San Diego region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO).

In December 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors (Board) approved an update to the 1995 LPA alignment for the Mid-Coast LRT Project to better serve the UCSD campus on both the east and west sides of I-5 and to integrate the LRT with existing and planned transit services at the UTC Transit Center. The Mid-Coast LRT project was included in the re-authorization of TransNet, approved by voters in November 2004. In April 2005, the SANDAG Transportation Committee approved re-combining the Balboa Extension with the University City Extension into a single project extending from the OTTC to University City and approved initiating the environmental review for the project. FTA concurred with SANDAG’s decision on July 24, 2006.

The SANDAG Board received a Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report in March 2010. The report documented the process of identifying alternatives that address the purpose and need, evaluating the alternatives, and selecting alternatives that were presented during the scoping process. After review of the report and receiving input from stakeholders, including the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (PWG), University City Planning Group, and stakeholder agencies, the SANDAG Board adopted three light-rail transit alternatives for consideration during the CEQA scoping process.

1.2 Description of the Mid-Coast Corridor

The Mid-Coast Corridor is anchored by University City on the north and Downtown San Diego on the south (Figure 1-1). University City is a designated Urban Center and mixed-use core and has the second most dense land uses in San Diego County. In addition to the UCSD campus, the Westfield UTC shopping center, and four regional hospitals, the University City area contains several high-density residential developments and is a significant employment center for the region with numerous high-
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and mid-rise office developments in the vicinity of Westfield UTC shopping center. Downtown San Diego, at the south end of the Mid-Coast Corridor, is the region’s only identified Metropolitan Center, and has the region’s densest land uses and high-rise development.

Significant growth is projected in the Mid-Coast Corridor. By 2030, SANDAG projects that the Mid-Coast Corridor’s population will exceed a quarter million, 14 percent more than in 2003. Employment in the corridor also is projected to increase by 14 percent, to almost 200,000 jobs. Increased population and employment will lead to increased travel demand in the corridor. Additionally, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) (SANDAG 2004) identified both the Downtown San Diego and University City areas as places of high residential and employment densities.

The RTP envisions that the dense population and employment centers anchoring both the northern and southern ends of the corridor would be served by improved transit. This improved system would attract new transit riders with service that has greater frequency, speed, and reliability than is possible with the current system composed of buses, commuter rail, and LRT extending only to the OTTC. The existing COASTER commuter rail service has widely spaced stations and therefore, provides limited service to the specific areas of transit opportunity within the corridor. The speed and reliability of bus service are hindered by roadway congestion. With increased congestion projected to occur in the future, the level of service, reliability, and efficiency of the existing transit system will decrease, with no additional priority improvements for transit.

1.3 Purpose of Report

This report documents the results of the CEQA scoping process, which is the first step in preparing the Draft SEIR. Per State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations, Sections 15082-15083), SANDAG used the scoping process to inform the public and involved agencies about the project, describing the corridor's transportation needs, including the transit alternatives identified to meet these needs, the criteria to be used for evaluating the alternatives, and the environmental issues to be studied. The goal of scoping was to encourage the active two-way communication of issues and concerns to help shape the scope of the Draft SEIR.

NEPA scoping was carried out in conjunction with the previous AA/DEIS/DEIR completed in 1995. This report documents the lead agencies' compliance with the scoping requirements of CEQA.
2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED PRESENTED DURING SCOPING

The Mid-Coast Corridor is characterized by dense urban centers and an abundance of regional activity centers and other major trip generators. Some of the densest residential, commercial, and institutional development in the county is located in the northern part of the corridor. Specifically, the UCSD campus, the Westfield UTC shopping center, and regional hospitals are clustered in the north part of the corridor and represent the second most dense land uses in the county. At the south end of the corridor is the region’s only identified Metropolitan Center—Downtown San Diego—with the region’s densest land uses and high-rise development.

Significant growth is projected for the Mid-Coast Corridor, resulting in a corridor population that will exceed a quarter million people by 2030, a 14-percent increase over 2003. Employment in the corridor is also projected to increase by 14 percent to almost 200,000 employees. Additionally, the RCP (SANDAG 2004) calls for increased density in both the downtown and UCSD and UTC areas. The net effect is that there are dense population and employment centers anchoring both the northern and southern ends of the corridor that define a hierarchy of “existing/planned” and “potential” smart growth centers that should be served by high-frequency transit.

Increased population and employment will lead to increased travel demand in the corridor. There are limited plans to expand highway system capacity. Highways will not be able to accommodate all of the future travel demand in the corridor and will become increasingly congested.

The existing transit system in the project study area does not offer the level of service (LOS) to meet the San Diego region’s goals for mobility, accessibility, reliability, and efficiency. To meet those goals, the study area needs a transit system that is focused on key destinations and has the frequency, speed, and reliability to attract new riders. The existing COASTER service has widely spaced stations and, therefore, provides limited service to the specific areas of transit opportunity within the study area. The existing Trolley currently terminates at the OTTC south of Clairemont. While transit mobility and accessibility within the study area are provided by express and local buses, the speed and reliability of bus service are hindered by roadway congestion. With increased congestion projected to occur in the future, the level of service, reliability, and efficiency of the existing transit system will decrease.

2.1 Transportation Needs

Following is a summary of the transportation needs in the Mid-Coast Corridor.

2.1.1 Transportation Capacity Needs to Be Expanded

Freeways and arterials in the corridor are generally congested, with many segments experiencing LOS D, E, and F in the peak periods. Interstate 5 (I-5) and I-805 generally experience LOS E or F in both the peak periods and peak directions. Projected growth in the corridor will contribute to increased congestion and degradation of LOS in the future. There is a need to increase transportation capacity in the corridor to address and accommodate the existing and future travel demand. The Mid-Coast Corridor LRT
Project, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and Managed Lanes are among the improvements identified in the RTP for the Mid-Coast Corridor.

2.1.2 **Alternatives to Congested Freeways and Roadways Need to Be Provided**

Topography and development in the corridor restrict the ability to widen freeways and major arterials to address congestion and increase capacity. As a result, efficient, high-capacity transit alternatives to the automobile need to be provided to increase overall transportation choices and “person throughput” in the corridor. In addition, to achieve regional air quality goals and greenhouse gas mandates, transit alternatives to the single-occupant auto will need to play a growing role in meeting the region’s mobility needs.

2.1.3 **Improvements that Complement and Integrate with Existing Transit Systems Need to Be Provided**

Travel patterns in the study area are diverse, with people traveling to, from, within, and through the study area. Transit improvements thus need to provide convenient connections to other elements of the regional transit system—the existing light rail, COASTER, and bus systems. Where possible, transit improvements should provide direct connections, with a minimum number of transfers and minimal inconvenience to passengers.

2.1.4 **Transit Improvements that Minimize Dependence on Auto Travel Need to Be Provided**

Pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly transit centers need to be included to help reduce commuter auto travel and parking demand.

2.1.5 **Transit Needs to Be Reliable and Competitive with the Auto in Terms of Travel Time**

Existing transit in the corridor follows slow, circuitous, and/or congested routes. As a result, transit travel times to and through the corridor are not competitive with the auto, even for the two north-south express bus routes. In addition, freeway and roadway congestion contribute to poor on-time performance for key transit routes, particularly for north-south Routes 30, 50 Express, and 150 Express. Direct transit routes with transit priority facilities and treatments are needed to provide fast and reliable transit that can compete with auto travel and can attract riders.

2.1.6 **Transit Needs to Effectively Serve the UCSD and University City Areas**

The UCSD and University City areas, in the northern portion of the Mid-Coast Corridor, are among the region’s major trip generators, yet neither is served by efficient or direct transit. Providing reliable transit connections to both the UCSD West and East Campuses and the University City area from key travel markets will help make transit a viable alternative to auto travel and accommodate existing and projected travel demand.

2.1.7 **Transit Needs to Better Support—and Be Supported by—Planned Development and Growth in the Corridor**

To help achieve regional livability and sustainability goals as stated in SANDAG’s RTP and RCP, new transit improvements in the corridor need to be integrated with existing
and planned transit-supportive land use. The University City, UCSD, and Clairemont areas all have high existing and projected trip densities, have high population and employment densities, and have been designated as smart growth areas in the RCP. The transportation system needs to provide improved transit to these areas to meet existing and future densities and regional goals.

2.2 Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide for the implementation of a transit project that addresses the identified transportation needs for the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project would improve public transit services between University City, Old Town, and Downtown San Diego and would connect corridor residents with other Trolley lines, thereby enhancing direct public access to other regional activity centers. The project would improve travel options to employment, education, medical, and retail centers for corridor residents, commuters, and visitors.
3.0 SCOPING PROCESS

This chapter documents the activities completed before and during the scoping process for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project to ensure public awareness of opportunities to review and comment on the project. The activities included the following:

- Early outreach activities (see below), including developing and implementing the Draft Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Public Involvement Plan (PIP);
- Posting the Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the State Clearinghouse and the county clerk to formally initiate the CEQA process;
- Mailing the NOP and meeting notices to responsible and trustee agencies and potentially affected residents and businesses to advise them of the project initiation and to invite their participation in the scoping meetings;
- Placing scoping meeting notices in newspapers of general circulation;
- Holding five scoping meetings at various locations within the corridor;
- Providing key documents and public information materials in both English and Spanish;
- Developing a stakeholder database (see below):
- Developing and implementing the project Web site to further facilitate the transmittal of information;
- Holding agency briefings;
- Holding meetings with potentially affected and/or interested parties in the project study area; and,
- Recording comments that were received at, and subsequent to, the scoping meetings through mail and email correspondence during the scoping period.

Comments and issues raised at the scoping meetings will be used to refine a range of alternatives and to conduct the technical analyses of alternatives that will be evaluated in the Draft SEIR.

3.1 Early Outreach Activities

Early outreach activities were conducted with a number of key stakeholders in the Mid-Coast Corridor. These efforts served to identify the outreach efforts needed to facilitate community participation, including providing up-to-date information about the project, informing the public about the project development process, and informing the public about the upcoming scoping period for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

3.1.1 Public Involvement Plan

The Draft PIP (Appendix I) was developed to identify the goals and objectives for public involvement and to outline specific strategies and tactics to effectively involve the public in the decision-making process. The Draft PIP was approved by the SANDAG Board in May 2009 for public review and comment from May 2009 through the end of the scoping period.
period. Public comments received have been included as an appendix to the Draft PIP and have been incorporated into the document, as appropriate. The Draft PIP serves as a guide directing public involvement activities throughout the project development process. It will be evaluated at key milestones in the process and updated as needed.

3.1.2 Stakeholder Database

The project team developed a stakeholder database to initiate communication with the community, including residents, businesses, organizations, chambers of commerce, etc. The initial list, which has been included as an appendix to the Draft PIP, contained nearly 200 stakeholders. This list was updated prior to and throughout the scoping period and now contains nearly 500 stakeholders. Attendees of scoping meetings, persons submitting their contact information with comments, and individuals requesting to be placed on the mailing list were added to the database for future information updates. The stakeholder database includes elected representatives, city and county officials, community planning groups, neighborhood councils, residential homeowner and renter associations, faith-based organizations, business organizations, developers, environmental groups, local schools and academic institutions, community service centers, major employers, minority organizations, accessibility advocates, taxpayers groups, and interested individuals. This list will continue to be updated as the project proceeds.

The stakeholder database includes e-mail addresses, where possible, to enable quick and efficient dissemination of electronic informational materials with the community as well as through US Postal Service, as appropriate.

3.1.3 Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit PWG was established in July 2009 to provide input on the following: the project purpose and need; alternatives for consideration in the environmental review process; the Draft SEIS/SEIR; and, the PIP. The PWG includes members from community planning groups, the business sector, environmental organizations, UCSD, the health care industry, transit riders, students, and other stakeholders in the corridor. The PWG is chaired by Supervisor Ron Roberts.

The PWG held its first meeting in September 2010. Eight meetings have been held through May 2010 covering the following topics:

- Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project History and Status;
- Review of the Draft PIP;
- FTA New Starts Program funding overview;
- Tour of the Mid-Coast Corridor;
- SANDAG overview;
- Overview of the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report; and,
- Selection of Alternatives for Scoping.
One of the scoping meetings was held in conjunction with a PWG meeting.

The PWG provided the following recommendations to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in April 2009:

1. Eliminate LRT Alternative 3 from scoping and advance LRT Alternatives 1 and 6 to scoping.
2. LRT Alternative 1 is the group’s preferred alternative.
3. Eliminate the Transportation System Management Alternative, LRT Alternatives 2 and 7, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternatives 1 – 4, and the Commuter Rail Alternative from further study.

### 3.1.4 Pre-Scoping Outreach

Pre-scoping outreach activities occurred during the alternatives analysis process to communicate up-to-date project information, the upcoming scoping period, and the project development process. Pre-scoping communications included a series of briefings and presentations for key stakeholders and other interested parties in the corridor. Up-to-date project information was posted on www.sandag.org/midcoast and www.keepsandiegomoving.com SANDAG Web sites, and publicized via e-mail and telephone communications.

Briefings or presentations were provided to the following groups:

**Elected/Agency Officials**
- State Senator Christine Kehoe
- California Transportation Commissioner John Chalker
- Supervisor Ron Roberts
- Mayor Jerry Sanders
- Councilmember Sherri Lightner
- Councilmember Kevin Faulconer
- Councilmember Donna Frye
- Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board Chair Harry Mathis
- MTS Chief Executive Officer Paul Jablonski

**Community Groups**
- Access to Independence
- Asian Business Association
- Bayside Community Center
- Centre City Advisory Committee
- City of San Diego Mayor’s Committee on Disability
• Clairemont Community Planning Group
• Clairemont Town Council
• Garden Communities
• Goodwill Industries
• La Jolla Colony Home Owners Association
• La Jolla Village Community Council
• Linda Vista Planning Group
• SANDAG Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)
• San Diego Workforce Partnership
• Sorrento Towers Senior Housing Community
• University Community Planning Group
• Urban League

Employers/Institutions
• La Jolla Country Day School
• La Jolla Village Center
• La Jolla Village Square
• Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
• San Diego Temple, Church of Latter Day Saints
• Scripps Memorial Hospital
• University of San Diego (USD)
• Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center

Environmental Organizations
• Friends of Rose Canyon
• Friends of Rose Creek
• Rose Creek Watershed Alliance
• San Diego Audubon Society
• San Diego River Park Foundation

Transportation Advocates
• MOVE San Diego
• San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
Business/Trade Organizations

- BIOCOM
- Downtown San Diego Partnership
- Gaslamp Quarter Association
- San Diego Convention & Visitors Bureau
- San Diego Council of Design Professionals American Institute of Architects
- San Diego County Taxpayers Association
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation

Information presented to the key stakeholders and other interested parties, as part of the pre-scoping outreach, included the following: the current status of the project, an overview of the project development process, and a discussion of the upcoming scoping period. These representatives were asked how they and their organizations would like to participate and be kept informed of project developments.

Pre-scoping outreach allowed key stakeholders and other interested parties an opportunity to ask questions and provide input on the project and process. Common questions included the following:

- Does LRT effectively serve densely populated areas in the corridor?
- Will the project integrate with planned smart growth areas?
- Is funding impacted by the poor economy?
- Can this line be extended to Sorrento Mesa?
- How will the VA Medical Center be served?
- How will this project benefit the economy?
- Will transit service result in increased crime?

Additionally, the following general comments were provided:

- The project needs to be coordinated with existing bus service;
- The project needs to be coordinated with the California High Speed Rail project;
- The project needs to ensure access for persons with disabilities;
- At project stations, parking needs to be provided;
- Concerned about environmental impacts (San Diego River, Rose Canyon, etc.);
- Concerned about noise and traffic impacts;
- Project information should be provided in a variety of formats, including audio/visual and in other languages;
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- Project information should be provided at community events (Clairemont Family Days, Linda Vista Multi-Cultural Fair, etc.); and,
- Expanded transit service is needed to serve the growing residential and employment areas.

3.1.5 Project Newsletters

In October 2009, SANDAG initiated an electronic eNewsletter to individuals and groups on the stakeholder e-mail list. Eight issues of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project eNewsletter have been distributed to a mailing list of nearly 500 stakeholders. The eNewsletter is also posted to the SANDAG Web site.

3.1.6 Project Fact Sheet

A project fact sheet is available on the project Web site (in both English and Spanish) and is available in hard copy, per request. The fact sheet (Appendix B) provides a project description, statement of the project need, a cost estimate, and the current funding and project status. The fact sheet will be updated as the project advances.

3.1.7 Web sites

The project team developed a Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Web site at www.sandag.org/midcoast. This site contains up-to-date project information, reports and other informational materials, a link to sign up for the eNewsletter, meeting notices, and a link to a dedicated e-mail address for comments on the project. This Web site address is promoted in all written materials, presentations, and other communications. The project Web site will be updated frequently with information about the project, including notice of public meetings, informational materials and reports (including the scoping report), and other information to enable the public to be kept informed about the progress of the project.

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is also featured on the TransNet Web site (www.KeepSanDiegoMoving.com). The TransNet Web site includes information about the project, its status and schedule, and how the public can get involved. Links are also provided on the TransNet Web site to direct the public back to the primary project Web site at www.sandag.org/midcoast, where the public can access project materials and reports and/or comment on the project.

The SANDAG Facebook was used for public notices promoting scoping meetings during the scoping period.

3.1.8 Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report

The Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report was completed in March 2010. The report provided information on the corridor and the range of alternatives under consideration. The report was presented to the PWG on March 17, 2010, the SANDAG Transportation Committee on March 19, 2010, and the SANDAG Board on March 26, 2010. Copies of the report were made available through SANDAG (both bound copy and electronic copy on CD) and placed on the SANDAG project Web site. The report provided the information on alternatives to support SANDAG’s identification of alternatives to present for CEQA scoping.
3.2 Initiation of Scoping (Notice of Preparation)

SANDAG issued a NOP for a SEIR to 120 agencies and tribes on April 28, 2010 (Appendix H). The NOP was posted with the State Clearinghouse on April 28, 2010 and the San Diego County Clerk’s Office on May 5, 2010. The NOP announced SANDAG’s intent to prepare a SEIR pursuant to CEQA. It provided formal notice of the opportunity to comment in writing and/or at the scoping meetings and commenced the CEQA scoping period. The NOP advised California agencies of their obligation to comment on the proposed project within 30 days.

3.3 Notice of Preparation Mailings

The NOP was distributed to responsible and trustee agencies. The NOP was distributed via a trackable delivery service (US Postal Service, Confirmed Delivery) on April 28, 2010. NOP packages were sent to:

- 22 Federal agencies;
- 17 Native American tribes;
- 41 state agencies;
- 11 regional agencies; and,
- 29 local agencies.

In total, 120 NOP packages were distributed; in some instances, NOPs were sent to several offices within an agency to ensure that all responsible and trustee agencies were properly notified. A list of the NOP packages sent to individuals at various tribes and agencies is provided in Appendix A. A letter distributed by the State Clearinghouse to responsible agencies, notifying them of the comment period, is also provided in Appendix A.

3.4 Public Notices

The project team developed a scoping meeting invitation postcard for distribution within the study area to ensure that area residents and businesses were aware of the project and opportunities for public comment. A mail-house was used to identify all business and resident addresses within one-half mile of the alternative alignments under consideration. The scoping meeting invitation postcard was mailed to a total of 24,959 addresses. A copy of this postcard can be found in Appendix B.

The project team also delivered scoping meeting invitation fliers to the offices of elected officials, cities, community planning groups, and other groups located within the corridor, and to community libraries and members of the PWG to increase community awareness of the project and to promote participation at the scoping meetings. Invitation fliers (Appendix B) were delivered via e-mail to the offices of the following entities:

**Elected Officials**

- SANDAG Board
- SANDAG Transportation Committee
• SANDAG Regional Planning Committee
• SANDAG Borders Committee
• SANDAG Public Safety Committee

Cities
• City Managers of all incorporated cities in San Diego County

Community Planning Groups
• Clairemont Community Planning Group
• Linda Vista Planning Group
• University Community Planning Group

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project PWG
• Anette Blatt, Scripps Health
• Greg Fitchitt, Westfield (VP of Development)
• Brian Gregory, UCSD
• Debra Gutzmer, SAIC
• Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
• Janay Kruger, University Community Planning Group
• Joe LaCava, Community Representative
• Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
• Andrew Poat, San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation
• David Potter, Potter & Associates
• Carmen Sandoval, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
• Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.
• Reed Vickerman, Amylin Pharmaceuticals
• Chris Westling, UCSD Student
• Daniel Allen, Transit Rider
• Robert Emery, Retired City of Poway Councilmember and MTS and SANDAG Board member
• Brad Gessner, San Diego Convention Center
• Charles Lungerhausen, Disability Advocate
• Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
• Evan McLaughlin, San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council
• Julie Nygaard, Retired city of Carlsbad Councilmember and MTS and SANDAG Board member
3.4.1 E-Mail Blasts

The project team disseminated an e-mail blast, or electronic mailing, to all stakeholders in the database to notify them of the scoping meetings and opportunities to provide public comment. Recipients were encouraged to forward these notices to their constituents and/or members.

3.4.2 Newspaper Ads

Meeting notices/advertisements were published in local newspapers to announce the scoping period and scoping meeting times and locations. The newspaper notices/advertisements provided contact information and the Web site address for members of the public wishing to gain additional information on the project. Newspapers that carried scoping meeting advertisements included:

- *Asian Journal* (circulation 35,000)
- *Beach & Bay Press* (circulation 18,500)
- *Clairemont Community News* (circulation 23,000)
- *El Latino* (circulation 80,500)
- *La Jolla Village News* (circulation 18,500)
- *North County Times* (circulation 85,970)
- *San Diego Downtown News* (circulation 18,500)
3.4.3 Newsletter Postings

The project team distributed information on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and schedule of scoping meetings to all City of San Diego elected officials for publication in their electronic newsletters.

3.5 Scoping Meetings

Five scoping meetings were conducted in the corridor, in compliance with CEQA guidelines. The meeting locations were selected based on geographic location, recommendations from local elected officials, and with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and public transit accessibility considerations.

In order to provide the greatest opportunity for community participation, meetings were scheduled for a three-hour period spanning from late afternoon into the early evening on weekdays. Following are the dates, locations, and number of attendees at each of the scoping meetings for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Clairemont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 5, 2010</td>
<td>Thursday, May 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Room</td>
<td>Clairemont High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 B Street, 7th Floor</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td>4150 Ute Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attendees: 13</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of California, San Diego Campus</th>
<th>Old Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 11, 2010</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Center East Ballroom</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9500 Gilman Drive</td>
<td>Gallegos Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92093</td>
<td>4050 Taylor Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attendees: 101</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of attendees: 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4126 Executive Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attendees: 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 215 people attended the scoping meetings. The sign-in sheets, comment cards, and transcripts for each of the five scoping meetings can be found in Appendix C.
3.5.1 Meeting Format

The meetings were conducted in an open house style with several stations providing information about the project. The stations included: Check-in, Project & Process Overview, Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, Alternatives for Scoping, Public Involvement, and Comments. Project team members staffed the stations, making themselves available to answer questions about the project. A Spanish translator and materials in Spanish were also available (no attendees required translation).

In addition to the staffed stations, a video presentation ran on a loop throughout the entire open house period. The video included information and graphics about the location and characteristics of the Mid-Coast Corridor, an animated map showing the three alternatives for scoping, and a “flyover” of each alternative using GoogleEarth satellite images of the corridor.

Comments were taken verbally with the assistance of a court reporter, or in writing by meeting participants filling out a comment form.

Table 3-1 identifies the number of verbal and written comments received at each of the scoping meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Verbal Comments</th>
<th>Written Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairemont</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 Meeting Materials and Handouts

The meeting materials utilized to communicate information about the project at the scoping meetings included: display boards, a scoping information brochure, a project fact sheet, and a brochure focusing on public involvement opportunities. The scoping information brochure and project fact sheet also were available in Spanish. All scoping meeting materials utilized, including comment and request for information cards, can be found in Appendix B.

3.5.2.1 Open House Display Boards

Open house display boards were used to provide project information under the following headings:

- Project Study Area
- Project Purpose & Need
- Project Development Process
• Alternatives Evaluated
• Summary of Evaluation of Alternatives
• 2030 Daily New Boardings
• FTA Cost Effectiveness Indicator
• Alternatives for Scoping
• Goals of the Public Involvement Plan
• Opportunities for Public Involvement

Copies of the display boards can be found in Appendix B.

3.5.2.2 Video Presentation
A video presentation ran on a loop throughout the entire open house period. The video included information and graphics about the location and characteristics of the Mid-Coast Corridor, an animated map showing the three alternatives for scoping, and a “flyover” of each alternative using GoogleEarth satellite images of the corridor.

3.5.3 Photography
The project team took digital photographs of the scoping meetings for future use by SANDAG.

3.6 Methods for Submission of Public Comments
A number of methods were available to the public for submitting comments during the scoping period. Members of the public could participate in one of the five scoping meetings and submit comments verbally or in writing by filling out a comment card. Comments could also be submitted via US Postal Service to Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA, 92101; by e-mail to midcoast@sandag.org; by fax to (619) 699-1905; or, by phone to (619) 595-5620.

The various methods for submitting comments were detailed on the project Web site, on the comment card, in the scoping meeting invitation flier, and in public notices published in newspapers. Copies of the comments received outside of scoping meetings are contained in Appendix D, Letter Comments, and Appendix E, Email and Phone Comments.

3.7 Interagency Scoping Meeting
An interagency scoping meeting was not held. SANDAG contacted the local offices of the following agencies to extend an offer to meet in person to discuss the project:

• US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)
• US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
• California Fish & Game
• Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region 9
• San Diego River Conservancy
Individual meetings were held with the USACE, San Diego River Conservancy, and California Department of Fish and Game. These notes from these meetings are provided in Appendix G.

3.8 Post Scoping Activities

The comments received during scoping are documented in this report and will be presented to the SANDAG Board. Comments received related to the alternatives will be addressed in the Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report. Comments received related to the scope of study for the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including comments related to the purpose and need, the evaluation, costs and funding, and the analysis of environmental effects will be addressed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
4.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

Comments on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project were received during the scoping period through the following methods: verbal testimony or written comment cards at the public scoping meetings; and via e-mail, postal mail, and telephone correspondence. The comments covered a variety of topics and were submitted by various parties, including: agencies, community organizations, elected officials, and members of the general public. The 30-day scoping period began on May 3, 2010 and closed June 1, 2010. Scoping comments were accepted for one week after the close of the scoping period to account for any comments that were in the mail. In all, 244 comment submissions were received containing more than 700 individual comments. Comment submissions included any letters, e-mails, phone calls, or testimony given by an individual or an organization. In most cases, each submission included multiple individual comments. In addition to the 244 comment submissions received, 2 comment submissions were received past the scoping period extended deadline, including one letter from the California Coastal Commission and one letter from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. Comments from these two comment submissions (letters) were not included within this report and will be addressed during the preparation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Copies of all 246 comment submissions can be found in Appendices C, D, and E of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report, depending on the type of correspondence.

This Summary of Scoping Comments is presented in two sections. Section 4.1 contains a Summary of Substantive Public and Organization Comments. Two-hundred and thirty-five public and organization comment submissions were received. Section 4.2 contains a Summary of Substantive Agency Comments. In total, nine agency comment letters were received. The agency comments are presented in Section 4.2 by the agency submitting the comments.

4.1 Summary of Substantive Public and Organization Comments

All comments submissions as well as individual comments were documented and entered into an electronic database for analysis. The database identified the name of the commenter and/or commenting agency, the source of the comment, the content of the comment, the topic(s) discussed by the comment, and commenter affiliations, if applicable. Form-letter submissions were grouped in the database, with each commenter noted in the record. Comments were categorized into six major categories and 21 sub-categories (or topics).

A brief analysis of the comments by category, and their respective topics, is provided below.

4.1.1 General Comments

General comments identified an overall need for improved transit service, not limited to the Mid-Coast Corridor. Suggestions included expanding transit hours and developing a transit policy/system that would eliminate the need for individual automobiles in the San Diego area. Other comments suggested a need for transit system improvements/features, including bathrooms and increased public art.
Several general comments pertained to the Mid-Coast Corridor. Some comments advocated for enhanced transit services to areas within the Mid-Coast Corridor not served by the proposed alternatives, including: La Jolla, Miramar, Pacific Beach, Ocean Beach, Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, Torrey Pines, the San Diego International Airport, I-805, I-8, and State Route 163 (SR 163). Other comments suggested serving entirely different corridors, such as I-15 or I-5 north of I-805.

There were also several suggestions for other projects in the Mid-Coast Corridor, but that do not specifically address the project purpose and need, including the following: COASTER enhancements, such as double track, a tunnel, and additional stations; roadway improvements, such as a Regents Road bridge; and, pedestrian and bicycle projects at various locations. One suggestion was to add pricing to existing freeways rather than to provide additional transit capacity. Another comment suggested following a holistic approach to San Diego County’s transportation problems rather than developing an individual project.

4.1.2 Comments Related to Purpose and Need

Five comments specifically were related to purpose and need for the project. The comments focused on the need for connecting transit service to the project, on clarifying the nature of Transit-Supportive land use identified in the need, expanding the definition of need to include additional travel markets, and clarifying what would constitute a competitive trip time. One comment questioned the need for the project and suggested the resources be directed to upgrade existing lines, including new elevators and the addition of restrooms.

4.1.3 Comments Related to Alternatives

Comments related to the alternatives were analyzed by each of the individual topics listed below. Of the 244 comment submissions received, 177 included comments related to the technology or alternatives. In addition to the major topics listed, there were questions about the type and location of supporting facilities and other project features, and regarding the interface of the project with shuttles and other transit services. One comment noted that any alternative must meet the ADA requirements. Other individual comments questioned the use of LRT in favor of heavy rail transit (powered by an electric third-rail) or diesel single-unit vehicles.

4.1.3.1 Bus Rapid Transit

Three comment submissions by one organization requested the inclusion of a BRT alternative in the SEIS/SEIR.

4.1.3.2 Light Rail Transit Alignments/Routes

Most of the comments received for alignments/routes were supportive of LRT Alternative 1. Ninetys-seven comment submissions specifically supported LRT Alternative 1, while twelve comment submissions were supportive of any LRT alternative, three supported LRT Alternative 1 or 6, and two supported LRT Alternative 3. One-hundred and seven comment submissions were opposed to LRT Alternative 3, three were opposed to LRT Alternative 6, and two were opposed to LRT Alternative 1.
Concerns with LRT Alternative 1 were related to its looping back to the south, complicating a potential future extension north. Support for LRT 1 noted service to UCSD and minimization of effects to Rose Canyon Open Space Park.

The comments that objected to LRT Alternative 3 cited the following: proximity to Rose Canyon Open Space Park, potential environmental effects of the project on Rose Canyon Open Space Park and adjacent areas, potential effects to wildlife and habitat, concern with the spread of invasive species, potential noise and other community impacts, and concerns with tunnel construction, including traffic disturbance on Executive Drive. The limited support for LRT Alternative 3 noted that the alignment would provide a more direct option for a potential future extension north.

Comments opposed to LRT Alternative 6 noted issues with its design including numerous small-radius curves and potential environmental and transportation effects on the Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center.

Several alternative alignments or project configurations were suggested, including:

- A design option to LRT Alternative 1 that would replace the UCSD West Station with a Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center Station crossing I-5 south of Voigt Drive.
- An alignment following LRT Alternative 1, but terminating in the vicinity of the Gilman Drive/Voigt Drive intersection, along with the construction of a separate dedicated right-of-way loop for rubber-tired transit that would connect UCSD, University Towne Centre (UTC) Transit Center, and the COASTER Sorrento Valley Station.
- An alignment following LRT Alternative 1, but extend north from the UCSD West Station through the UCSD Park north of Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue.
- An alignment serving Pacific Beach by crossing Mission Bay on Ingram Street, rather than using the existing MTS/San Diego Northern Railway (SDNR) right-of-way.

### 4.1.3.3 Light Rail Transit Stations

Thirty-four of the comment submissions discussed stations. Many supported proposed station locations. Others suggested either eliminating or adding stations. The Executive Drive, UCSD West, and Clairemont Drive Stations were suggested for elimination. Additional stations were suggested at SR 52, Gilman Drive, Jutland Drive, and the VA Medical Center. Seven comment submissions supported a station at the VA Medical Center. The SR 52, Gilman Drive, and Jutland Drive locations were each identified as potential station locations in two submissions.

Other comments related to stations included providing good non-motorized transportation access, good bus connections, park-and-ride facilities, secure bike parking, and design to support redevelopment in the vicinity of the stations. One comment suggested a major roadway grade-separated connection from Grand Avenue to Morena Boulevard near the Balboa Avenue Station.
4.1.4 Comments Related to Evaluation

Five comments related to the evaluation of the alternatives. The comments requested additional details on how the preliminary analysis was completed and the process used by the FTA to evaluate New Starts projects. There were requests to change the presentation of findings, including using highly detailed maps for planning-level analysis. One comment requested that the SEIR evaluate the competitiveness of transit travel times to drive times, another indicated concern that standard FTA user benefit calculations over-estimate the effect of transfers. One comment noted the need for complete documentation of travel forecasting methods and assumptions.

4.1.5 Costs and Funding

Twenty-four submissions included comments related to costs and funding. Several comments observed cost differences between alternatives evaluated. Multiple comments suggested reduced rate or free fares. Highway and other funds were suggested to be redirected to transit. Other comments requested that no University of California funds be used to support the project and that the dedicated TransNet funds be redirected to other transit improvements. Other comments were concerned with the long-term costs of the project, considering the current economic recession. One recommendation was to accelerate the project to seek Federal funds earlier.

4.1.6 Comments Related to Analysis of Environmental Effects

Sixty-eight comment submissions included comments related to the scope of analysis for the individual topics listed below.

4.1.6.1 Traffic and Parking

Twenty-two comments were related to traffic and parking effects both during construction and operation. Comments noted the need for park-and-ride facilities both to serve local demand and to intercept southbound I-5 traffic. Some comments stated that students and workers already park in residential neighborhoods and take transit to their destination; as such, they were concerned that the project would increase this occurrence. Several comments related to how the system will integrate with and effects to the bus system.

Traffic concerns included the following: increased general traffic and congestion, loss of travel lanes, the need for transit signal priority, conflicts between transit and roadway traffic in the UCSD area, and increased traffic around stations. Also, the need for an interface with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and project coordination with other transportation projects was noted. Comments noted that mitigation needs to be considered to facilities where the project would cause an impact.

4.1.6.2 Non-motorized Transportation

Numerous comments were related to providing good pedestrian and bicycle access to the stations. Other comments requested recreational trail improvements in the vicinity of the project.
4.1.6.3 Land Use
Land use comments included concerns with density, if it would be sufficient to support the system, and recommendations to consider transit-oriented development potential. One comment noted an “urban farm” at UCSD for consideration during evaluation. General plan and municipal code requirements should be reviewed and any planned smart-growth centers should be identified.

4.1.6.4 Neighborhoods
Neighborhood concerns included parking pressure from residents outside of the neighborhoods using the system.

4.1.6.5 Safety and Security
One comment requested the analysis of any correlation between transit and crime and noted the large coverage area of the San Diego Police Department. Safety concerns were voiced about at-grade pedestrian track crossings, especially by students, in the UCSD and University City areas.

4.1.6.6 Economic Development
Comments on economic development were related to redevelopment of areas around stations. One comment noted that the long-term economic benefits of transit should be presented.

4.1.6.7 Right-of-Way Acquisitions and Relocations
Opposition was voiced to the acquisition of parkland for the project.

4.1.6.8 Environmental Justice
Comments included the need to consider access for and impacts to low-income and minority populations to transit. The EIS should identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations and document the process for community involvement.

4.1.6.9 Visual
Comments included a request for renderings showing how the project will look in the UCSD area and a consideration of lighting effects on surrounding uses, including wildlife.

4.1.6.10 Air Quality
One comment noted that the project would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project is located in an ozone nonattainment and a carbon monoxide maintenance area. One comment noted that mobile source air toxics should be addressed.

4.1.6.11 Noise and Vibration
Several comments were related to the analysis of noise and vibration. An explanation of the science of acoustics was requested. Other requests included the measurement of existing levels as well as the evaluation of future project noise generation, including wheel squeal, track maintenance effects, and cumulative effects for at-grade and elevated guideway sections and for supporting facilities. Concerns included the Balboa/Morena, La Jolla Colony, La Jolla Village Square, and University City areas and noise effects on wildlife in open-space areas. Other comments were related to bus and road noise from other projects.
4.1.6.12 Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials
An analysis of solid waste impacts was requested. One comment asked that the project consider green infrastructure and material reuse and recycling. One comment requested the evaluation of toxics and human health impacts.

4.1.6.13 Ecosystems
Comments noted a need to evaluate the project as a barrier to wildlife, especially if fencing is introduced. The evaluation of habitat loss, lighting, and noise effects on wildlife was requested. One comment noted a concern that invasive species could be introduced by Trolley operations. Potential mitigation sites were noted in the Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment if the project would create impacts that would require mitigation. Analysis of potential temporary and long-term impacts to Least Bell’s Vireo was requested.

4.1.6.14 Water Resources
Comments identified concerns with flood control, hydrology, runoff from on-site contamination, water supply, and hydraulic modeling. An analysis of stormwater impacts was requested. Comments stated that functional conditions of waters and riparian areas should be evaluated. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will be applicable to the project and that measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to waters should be incorporated into the project.

4.1.6.15 Parks
One-hundred and nine comment submissions, more than for any other environmental topic, included comments related to parks and parklands. The comments focused on the protection and analysis of potential effects on Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park, Marian Bear Memorial Park, and Rose Canyon Open Space Park. Comments noted a need to address project compatibility with relevant park plans, including the Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resources Management Plan, the San Diego River Master Plan, and with the Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment. Several comments were related to existing uses of and resources within the parks, including the current frequent practice of access to the parks by illegal trespass and crossing of the existing MTS/SDNR right-of-way. Opposition to the use of the parkland was noted. The potential to impact the Mission Valley Preserve was also noted.

4.1.6.16 Historic/Cultural Resources
The Native American Heritage Commission identified Native American cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project and commented that cultural landscapes should be considered along with other resources evaluated and consider avoidance when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

4.1.6.17 Construction Impacts
Several comments noted that construction effects related to traffic, access, water quality, and jobs should be evaluated.

4.1.6.18 Indirect and Cumulative Effects
Comments identified a need to consider the cumulative effects of various planned projects, including the planned I-5 improvements, on a broad range of the environmental
4.2 Summary of Substantive Agency Comments

Several agencies provided comments on the project during the scoping period (Appendix D of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report). This section provides a summary of comments presented by agencies during the scoping period. These agencies have regulatory responsibilities related to the project, which may include permits or approvals required for project implementation; therefore, their comments and directions are reproduced in detail in this report. The agencies that submitted comments during the scoping period include:

- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United State Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Department of Transportation
- State of California Native American Heritage Commission
- State of California Public Utilities Commission
- University of California, San Diego
- City of San Diego

4.2.1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) commends the FTA and SANDAG for seeking to improve public transportation service. The Draft SEIS should:

- Explore a range of reasonable alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative, and briefly discuss reasons for eliminating alternatives.
- Identify opportunities for the alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts while fulfilling the project purpose.
- Identify measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, mobile source air toxics (MSAT) and particulate matter (PM).
- Ensure that the emission from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved state implementation plan (SIP).
- Include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan.
- Identify the cumulative contributions to greenhouse gas emissions that will result from implementation of the project.
- Discuss how the project will impact existing vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths due to project construction or operation.
- Evaluate “green infrastructure” and industrial materials recycling.
- Address requirements of the EPA and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the CWA.
- Identify whether the proposed alternative may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation measure for any adverse impacts.
- Document the process used for community involvement and communication.

4.2.2 United States Fish and Wildlife Service

The USFWS noted that sensitive habitats exist within the project area, including coastal sage scrub, wetlands, salt marsh, chaparral, and grassland. The project also falls under the City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (SAP). Following is a summary of the USFWS recommendations for information to be included in the SEIS/SEIR:

- Discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project.
- List and assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area.
- Discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources.
- Mitigation measures for unavoidable adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. The analyses should include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources.

4.2.3 California Department of Fish and Game

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) provided both general and specific comments.

4.2.3.1 Specific Comments

The project is located within the MSCP Subarea Plan (and Implementing Agreements under the NCCP program) for the City of San Diego. The CDFG is interested in options to minimize grading impacts to preserve lands. The CDFG will consider the alternatives analyzed in the context of their relative impacts on biological resources, on both a local and regional level. Take authorization pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and the Federal Endangered Species Act must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in a "take" of state- and/or federally-listed species of plants or animals. Identify location of construction and post-construction best management practices related to the development footprint; native plants should be used to the greatest extent feasible.

4.2.3.2 General Comments

The CDFG has responsibility for wetland and riparian habitats. A jurisdictional delineation of the creeks and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the Draft SEIR. For any activity that will affect a streambed, the project applicant must notify the CDFG to determine if a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required.
The CDFG notes several of the same document requirements already listed by the EPA and provided details on how the analysis should be completed and what mitigation should be considered.

4.2.4 California Department of Toxic Substances Control

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (CDTSC) commented the SEIR should:

- Evaluate whether conditions within the project area may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Information on data sources was provided.
- Identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated with hazardous substances.
- Investigate the presence of other hazardous chemicals, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs) for facilities to be demolished.
- Protect human health and the environment of sensitive receptors during any construction or demolition activities.
- Manage any hazardous wastes in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law.

4.2.5 California Department of Transportation

Caltrans supports the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, as it would provide new travel options and improve mobility within the congested I-5 corridor. Based on the coordination that has occurred over the years between Caltrans and SANDAG, Caltrans has no major concerns with locating the proposed Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project within the Caltrans right-of-way as planned.

Any work performed within the right-of-way requires discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and must be clearly identified and included in the environmental document. The identification of avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be a condition of the Caltrans encroachment permit approval as well as the procurement of any necessary regulatory and resource agency permits.

Improvement plans for construction within the State Highway right-of-way must include the appropriate engineering information consistent with the state code, and signed and stamped by a professional engineer registered in the State of California. The Caltrans Permit Manual contains a listing of typical information required for project plans.

All design and construction must be in conformance with the ADA.

4.2.6 State of California Native American Heritage Commission

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) performed a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search in the NAHC SLF Inventory, established by the legislature pursuant to PRC §5097.94(a), and Native American Cultural resources were identified within the APE, the Old Town, Pacific Beach, and La Jolla areas. We recommend that you contact persons
4.2.7 State of California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has regulatory and safety oversight over railroad crossings in California. In the development of the environmental document, SANDAG should analyze impacts to highway-rail crossings. CPUC approval is required for the construction of any new crossing. SANDAG should consider grade separations for major thoroughfares and study pedestrian and vehicle traffic at the crossings. During the process, SANDAG should be in contact with staff to discuss any relevant concerns or issues.

4.2.8 University of California, San Diego

The UCSD commented that bringing additional alternative transportation options to our growing campus and to the San Diego region is critical to a healthier environment and the region's economic vitality. Extending the LRT to our West and East Campuses as soon as possible is imperative to allow our campus to minimize its impact on San Diego's freeways, local roads, and intersections.

UCSD intends to be an engaged partner to ensure safety and security of our campus community, including the following: students in Sixth College, adjacent to the UCSD West Station (Pepper Canyon location), which was included in the University Center/Sixth College Neighborhood Plan adopted by UCSD in 2004; students who attend the Preuss School, our charter middle/high school on UCSD East Campus; and, the preservation of emergency and non-emergency access to the UCSD Medical Center.

Safe and effective pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation, to, from, and on the campus, are top concerns and priorities. UCSD has developed a detailed list of issues that must be addressed and mitigated by the project. Issues include, but are not limited to, noise, vibration, safety, security, circulation, biology, construction staging, electromagnetic fields, and aesthetic impacts.

The following comments are based on the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report and represent issues noted by members of the UCSD community:

- **LRT 1. Advantages:** impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized. **Disadvantages:** several at-grade crossings, impacting vehicular circulation and visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists; separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive; Integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Drive direct access ramp (DAR) creates a complex issue for construction phasing and operation; impacts to Preuss School, including safety of pedestrians; impacts to campus recreation lands; impacts to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles.

- **LRT 4. Advantages:** impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized; aerial alignment on UCSD East Campus minimizes circulation impacts; potential for reduced LRT right-of-way requirements; regional access to UCSD East Station more easily accommodated at this location, with elevated station allowing flexibility of land
uses; aerial alignment may better integrate with proposed Voigt Drive DAR improvements. \textit{Disadvantages:} separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive; impacts to campus recreation lands; integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Drive DAR, with Campus Point Drive realignment, is critical during design, construction, and operation; coordination with access to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus needed.

- \textbf{LRT 5. Advantages:} avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; reduces impacts to Preuss School; regional access to UCSD East Station more easily accommodated at this location; minimizes impact to baseball field; eliminates impact to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles. \textit{Disadvantages:} impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources; impacts to recreational lands; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; potential impacts to future UCSD East Campus development sites; Campus Point Drive realignment as part of proposed Voigt Drive DAR still being studied, which may impact the feasibility of this alignment.

- \textbf{LRT 3. Advantages:} avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; avoids impacts to campus recreational lands; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. \textit{Disadvantages:} impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; potential impacts to Mesa Housing and Science Research Park; and, constrained design opportunities for future I-5/Gilman Drive bridge project.

- \textbf{LRT 6. Advantages:} avoids Voigt Drive, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. \textit{Disadvantages:} impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; impacts to Health Sciences buildings to be constructed on UCSD East Campus (office buildings and CTRI Phase 2); and, potential impacts to planned I-5/Gilman Drive bridge.

\textbf{4.2.9 City of San Diego}

Comments were received from City of San Diego staff from the Park and Recreation, City Planning and Community Investment, Environmental Services, Storm Water, and The Development Services Departments in response to the NOP. Analysis of the alternatives should also include an assessment of consistency with any relevant park plans, including the Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resources Management Plan, the Draft 2005 San Diego River Master Plan, and any other relevant documents for the open space areas.

The section for Least Bell’s Vireo should address temporary construction impacts and long-term impacts from loss of habitat and/or shading along Rose Creek and the San Diego River. Please include an analysis of these potential impacts.
The project may have potential impacts to Marian Bear Memorial and Rose Canyon Open Space (OS) Parks, and the Mission Valley Preserve.

Station locations at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue Stations should consider bicycle and pedestrian access, and potential for future infill and transit-oriented development (TOD).

Under “Probable Environmental Effects”, address the solid waste impacts associated with the project. Impacts from storm water be evaluated and addressed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The transportation impact analysis prepared for the SEIR should follow the guidelines of the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual, July 1998.

Cumulative development projects in the project area should be identified/updated in coordination with the City’s City Planning and Community Investment and Development Services Departments.

The environmental document should analyze impacts to all resources within the City of San Diego boundaries consistent with the City of San Diego’s Significance Determination Thresholds.

Consideration should be given to additional and/or alternate station locations, especially in the area between the proposed Balboa Avenue Station and the station near Nobel Drive and near the Gilman Drive/I-5 interchange area.

4.3 Comment Database
A copy of the comment database is provided in Appendix F of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Report.
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## APPENDIX A  AGENCY AND NOP MAILING LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Job Title/Department</th>
<th>Company/Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, 11th Floor</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Coordinator, Disability Services Program</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1200 Third Ave. Suite 1300 MS 56C</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay M.</td>
<td>Goldstone</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 11A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Director, City Planning Community Investment Department</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 5A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Director, Development Services Department</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1222 1st Ave, MS301</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>Director, Library</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>820 E Street</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>LoMedico</td>
<td>Director, Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #37C</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Interim Director, Public Utilities - Water &amp; Wastewater</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>9192 Topaz Way, MS 901</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>Director, Public Works</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, 9th Floor MS 9A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Lightner</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 1</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Faulconer</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 2</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 3</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 4</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>DeMaio</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 5</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Frye</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 6</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marti</td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 7</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Job Title/Department</td>
<td>Company/Agency</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Hueso</td>
<td>City Councilmember, District 8</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS #10A</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt</td>
<td>Ekard</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Director, Department of Planning Land Use</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>5201 Ruffin Road, Ste. B</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 1</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Slater-Price</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 3</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 4</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 335</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Aponte</td>
<td>Director, Library</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>10433 Reserve Drive</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thella</td>
<td>Bowens</td>
<td>President/Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>3225 North Harbor Drive</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Valderrama</td>
<td>Commission Chairman</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>3165 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Nakamura</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>San Diego Unified School District</td>
<td>4100 Normal Street, Room 2129</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John de</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>San Diego Unified School District</td>
<td>4100 Normal Street, Room 2129</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Culp</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>401 B Street, Suite 800</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Mathis</td>
<td>Board Chairman</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>1255 Imperial Avenue, Ste. 1000</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Jablonski</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>1255 Imperial Avenue, Ste. 1000</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Kightlinger</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</td>
<td>P.O. Box 54153</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90054-0153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Job Title/Department</th>
<th>Company/Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Board Chairman</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>600 Eucalyptus Ave.</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>810 Mission Avenue</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kard</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>San Diego Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>9150 Chesapeake Dr.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Holt Pfeifer</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>401 B Street, Suite 800</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L</td>
<td>Gallegos</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>401 B Street, Suite 800</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Steindorf</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>9500 Gilman Drive</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>9500 Gilman Drive</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Ito</td>
<td>Transportation Projects</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
<td>1001 I Street, PTSDAQTPB</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>California Business, Transportation, &amp; Housing Agency</td>
<td>980 9th Street, Suite 2450</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814-2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherilyn</td>
<td>Sarb</td>
<td>Deputy Director, San Diego Coast District Office</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>7575 Metropolitan Drive, Suite 103</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>Manager, Statewide Planning</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>45 Fremont Street, Ste. 2000</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105-2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Project Manager, Southern California</td>
<td>California Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>1330 Broadway, 11th Floor</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94612-2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Department of Conservation</td>
<td>801 K Street, MS 24-02</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>Environmental Program Manager</td>
<td>California Department of Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>1416 9th Street, 13th Floor</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Juarez</td>
<td>Region 5, Habitat Conservation Program</td>
<td>California Department of Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>4949 Viewridge Avenue</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>McCamman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California Department of Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection</td>
<td>P.O. Box 944246</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>California Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>1600 9th Street, Room 46</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Job Title/Department</td>
<td>Company/Agency</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terese</td>
<td>Weathers-Reyes</td>
<td>CEQA Coordinator - Housing Policy Division</td>
<td>California Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>1800 Third Street, Room 430</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship Section</td>
<td>California Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942896</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94296-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guenther</td>
<td>Moskat</td>
<td>Chief of Planning and Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>California Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
<td>P.O. Box 806</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95812-0806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadell</td>
<td>Gayou</td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>California Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>901 P Street, 2nd Floor</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Officer</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>1516 Ninth Street, MS-40</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>California Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2815</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Castrillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>3650 Schriever Ave</td>
<td>Mather</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95655-4203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Sellers</td>
<td>Southern Regional Branch Administrator, Response and Recovery Division</td>
<td>California Governor's Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>P.O. Box 419047</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95741-9023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Governor's Office of Planning and Research</td>
<td>1400 10th Street, P.O. Box 3044</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95812-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>California Health and Human Services Agency</td>
<td>1600 Ninth St., Rm. 460</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Leavitt</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>925 L Street Suite 1425</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Loetscher</td>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>2555 1st Avenue</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Lands Commission</td>
<td>100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100 South</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Treadway</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td>915 Capitol Mall, Room 364</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>California Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Street, Ste. 1311</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942896</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94296-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Schwarzenegger</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>California Office of the Governor</td>
<td>State Capitol Building</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Clanon</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>505 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>505 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Job Title/Department</td>
<td>Company/Agency</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimla</td>
<td>Rhinehart</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>1120 N Street, MS-52</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Chief Deputy Director</td>
<td>CalRecycle</td>
<td>801 K Street, MS 19-01</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Director, District 11</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>4050 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randell</td>
<td>Iwasaki</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Caltrans, Division of Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942873</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvell</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Division Chief</td>
<td>Caltrans, Division of Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>4050 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>4050 Taylor Street, MS 240</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>San Diego Region 9</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego River Conservancy</td>
<td>1350 Front Street, Ste. 3024</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Testa</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>State Board of Mining and Geology</td>
<td>801 K Street, Suite 2015</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3044</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95812-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Roddy</td>
<td>Division of Water Quality</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>P.O. Box 806 (1001 &quot;I&quot; Street)</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95812-4025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Job Title/Department</th>
<th>Company/Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>1100 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Suite 803</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Administrator for Region IX</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>1111 Broadway, Suite 1200</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607-4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Craig</td>
<td>Fugate</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>500 C Street, SW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Waidelich</td>
<td>California Division Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>1200 New Jersey Ave., SE</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin</td>
<td>Settje</td>
<td>Regional Administrator, Region 7</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
<td>801 I Street, Suite 466</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Szabo</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
<td>1200 New Jersey Ave., SE</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Regional Administrator, Region IX</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>201 Mission Street, Suite 1650</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105-1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>McInnis</td>
<td>Southwest Regional Administrator</td>
<td>NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>501 West Ocean Blvd.</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90802-4213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Job Title/Department</td>
<td>Company/Agency</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Rossides</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Transportation Security Administration (TSA)</td>
<td>601 S. 12th Street</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>22202-4220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L.</td>
<td>Van Antwerp</td>
<td>Lieutenant General</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>441 G Street, NW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20314-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Thomas H. Magness</td>
<td>District Commander, Los Angeles District</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>915 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1101</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven</td>
<td>Chu</td>
<td>Secretary of Energy</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>1000 Independence Ave., SW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Sebelius</td>
<td>Secretary of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>200 Independence Ave., SW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>Secretary of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>451 7th Street, SW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Director, Office of Environmental Policy</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior</td>
<td>1849 C Street, N.W.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>Blumenfeld</td>
<td>Regional Administrator, Region IX</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>75 Hawthorne Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>1849 C Street , NW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>22040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Bartel</td>
<td>Field Supervisor, Carlsbad Fish &amp; Wildlife Office</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>6010 Hidden Valley Road, Suite 101</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ren</td>
<td>Lohoetener</td>
<td>Regional Director, Pacific Southwest Region</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indian Tribes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tribe Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwin &quot;Thorpe&quot;</td>
<td>Romero</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Barona Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>1095 Barona Road</td>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>La Chappa</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>36190 Church Road</td>
<td>Campo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Ewiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians (formerly known as the Cuyapaip Band of Mission Indians)</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2250</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca M.</td>
<td>Osuna</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians</td>
<td>1040 East Valley Parkway</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Job Title/Department</td>
<td>Company/Agency</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Meza</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Jamul Indian Village, A Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>P.O. Box 612</td>
<td>Jamul</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Christman</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee</td>
<td>56 Viejas Grade Road</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vonne</td>
<td>Peck</td>
<td>Tribal Chair</td>
<td>La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians</td>
<td>22000 Highway 76</td>
<td>Pauma Valley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwendolyn</td>
<td>Parada</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>La Posta Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1120</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>Kupsch</td>
<td>Spokeswoman</td>
<td>Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 189</td>
<td>Warner Springs</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1302</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Romero</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 270</td>
<td>Santa Ysabel</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 50</td>
<td>Pala</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris C.</td>
<td>Devers</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Pauma Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 369</td>
<td>Pauma Valley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>Mazzetti</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Rincon Nation of Luiseno Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 68</td>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen E.</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>San Pasqual Band of Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 365</td>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Spokesman</td>
<td>Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 130</td>
<td>Santa Ysabel</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel J.</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>5459 Dehesa Road</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby L.</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 908</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91903-0908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice of Preparation

May 3, 2010

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
    SCH# 2010051001

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Acting Director

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
SCH# 2010051001
Project Title Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
Lead Agency San Diego Association of Governments

Type NOP Notice of Preparation
Description NOTE: Reference SCH# 1990011025.
Transit improvements within the Mid-Coast Corridor generally defined as the area centering on Interstate 5 and extending from Downtown San Diego on the south to University City on the north.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Anne Steinberger
Agency San Diego Association of Governments
Phone 619 699-1937
Fax
Email
Address 401 B Street, Suite 800
City San Diego
State CA
Zip 92101

Project Location
County San Diego
City San Diego
Region
Cross Streets
Lat / Long
Parcel No.
Township
Range
Section
Base

Proximity to:
Highways I-5
Airports San Diego
Railways MTS/SDNRM ROW
Waterways Pacific Ocean, San Diego River, Rose Canyon Creek
Schools UCSD
Land Use Within or adjacent to existing transportation rights of way along local streets, I-5 and the railroad.

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Fiscal impacts; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

Reviewing Agencies
Resources Agency; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; CA Department of Public Health; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 11; Air Resources Board; Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9; Other Agency(ies)

Date Received 05/03/2010  Start of Review 05/03/2010  End of Review 06/01/2010

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Appendix B
Public Scoping Meeting
Invitation and Materials
The Project

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project proposes to extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) north to the University City community of San Diego, California. The extension will link major destinations including Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC) shopping mall, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) with OTTC and downtown San Diego.

The current Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the project, approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2003, is a Light Rail Transit (Trolley) project. It begins just north of the Old Town Transit Center and travels in existing railroad right-of-way and alongside Interstate 5 to serve UCSD and UTC. Between OTTC and SR-52, stations are proposed at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue. Within the University City area, stations are proposed at Nobel Drive, UCSD west campus, UCSD east campus, Executive Drive, and the UTC transit center.

The Need

Freeways and arterials in the Mid-Coast corridor are generally congested and traffic congestion is projected to increase as the region grows. Population in the entire corridor is forecast to increase 14 percent and employment is forecast to increase 14 percent by the year 2030. The University City area has developed as a major employment and high density residential area, similar to downtown San Diego. University City is San Diego’s second downtown and UCSD is one of the region’s largest trip generators; however, neither is served by direct or fast transit.

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project would provide an effective alternative to congested freeways and roadways for travelers and improve public transit services and improve travel options by connecting the corridor with areas served by the existing trolley system.

Project Status

The Federal Transit Administration and SANDAG are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. To start the process, SANDAG recently completed a Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives report to present alternatives for
the corridor to the public and the SANDAG Board of Directors. On April 23, 2010, the Board approved three LRT alternatives for consideration during Scoping for the project’s environmental document.

The Scoping Period is being held May 3 through June 1, 2010 to provide an opportunity for the public to weigh in at an early phase in the environmental review for the project. The Scoping Report will provide responses to issues identified during Scoping, and a staff recommendation for which alternative(s) should move forward for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document.

SANDAG will complete a Draft SEIS/SEIR which will be circulated for public and agency comment. A public hearing will be held to present the results documented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR and to hear all comments. A Final SEIS/SEIR will address public and agency comments and concerns raised about the Draft report, and a record of decision and notice of determination will conclude the environmental review process. At this point, the project development process will continue into final design and project construction.

**Project Costs**

The estimated cost of the LRT project including planning and preliminary engineering work is $1.2 billion. The cost of right-of-way acquired to date is approximately $20 million.

**Funding Status**

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has been identified as a high-priority project by SANDAG and is part of the TransNet Early Action Program. TransNet will provide funding for 50 percent of the project’s capital cost, with the remaining 50 percent anticipated to come from the FTA Section 5309 New Starts program. TransNet also will provide operating funds for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project through the year 2048. To date, the San Diego region has invested a total of $32.1 million on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project for planning, preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition.

**Summary**

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is SANDAG’s highest priority transit project. It will improve access to growing employment, education and residential areas. LRT, which would be an extension of the San Diego Trolley, works particularly well in this corridor because:

- It connects with the existing regional rail system at the Old Town Transit Center;
- It offers a one-seat (no transfer) commute between downtown San Diego and University City, including major activity centers such as UCSD, UTC and Old Town; and
- LRT can accommodate large crowds very well for special events in both downtown San Diego and Mission Valley.

**Get Involved**

SANDAG has embarked on a comprehensive public involvement effort to communicate information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and to provide opportunities for input during the environmental review process.

- Visit [www.sandag.org/midcoast](http://www.sandag.org/midcoast) for up-to-date project information
- Subscribe to the E-mail Newsletter online
- Participate in Scoping Meetings
- Attend SANDAG public meetings
- Provide written comments
- Request a presentation for your neighborhood group or civic association by contacting midcoast@sandag.org or (619) 595-5620
El Proyecto

El Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast propone extender el servicio de transporte público desde el Centro de Transporte de Old Town (OTTC, por sus siglas en inglés) al norte hasta la comunidad de University City de San Diego, California. La extensión enlaza a importantes destinos, incluyendo el centro comercial Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC), la Universidad de California, San Diego (UCSD) con el OTTC y el downtown San Diego.

La Alternativa Preferida Localmente (LPA, por sus siglas en inglés) del proyecto aprobado por la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG en 2003, es un proyecto de tren ligero (Trolley). Este comienza justo al norte del Centro de Transporte Old Town y recorre por el derecho de vía a lo largo de la Interestatal 5 para dar servicio a UCSD y UTC. Entre el OTTC y la carretera SR-52, se proponen estaciones en Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive y Balboa Avenue. En el área de University City, se proponen estaciones en Nobel Drive, UCSD west campus, UCSD east campus, Executive Drive, y el centro de transporte de UTC.

La Necesidad

Las autopistas y calles en el corredor Mid-Coast generalmente están congestionadas y se proyecta que el congestionamiento vehicular aumente mientras crece la región. Se proyecta que la población en el área del corredor aumente 14 por ciento y se estima que el empleo aumente 14 por ciento para el año 2030. University City se ha desarrollado como una importante área de empleo y residencial, similar al downtown San Diego. University City es el Segundo downtown de San Diego y UCSD es uno de los mayores generadores de viajes en la región; sin embargo, ninguno cuenta con servicio directo de transporte público rápido.

El Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast ofrecerá una alternativa a las autopistas y caminos congestionados para el traslado de personas y mejorar los servicios de transporte público y opciones de traslado al comunicar el corredor con áreas que cuentan con el sistema del Trolley.

Estatus del Proyecto

SANDAG hará un Borrador del SEIS/SEIR (Enunciado de Impacto Ambiental Suplementario/Subsiguiente Reporte de Impacto Ambiental), el cual será presentado para comentarios del público y agencias. Se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública para presentar los resultados documentados en el Borrador del SEIS/SEIR y para escuchar todos los comentarios. Para iniciar el proceso, recientemente SANDAG completó Borrador del Reporte...
de Evaluación Comparativa de Alternativas para presentar las alternativas para el corredor de transporte público a la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG. El 23 de abril de 2010, la Directiva aprobó tres alternativas LRT (tren ligero) para su consideración durante el sondeo para el documento ambiental del proyecto.

El periodo de Sondeo Público del 3 de mayo hasta el 1 de junio de 2010, ofrece la oportunidad al público de sopesar en una fase temprana la revisión ambiental del proyecto. El Reporte de Sondeo (Scoping Report) dará respuestas a los asuntos identificados durante el Sondeo, así como las recomendaciones del personal por cuáles alternativa(s) deba(n) avanzar en el análisis más detallado para el borrador del documento ambiental.

SANDAG terminará el Borrador SEIS/SEIR cubriendo las alternativa(s) identificadas y buscará la aprobación de FTA para comenzar los trabajos Preliminares de Ingeniería de la Alternativa Preferida Localmente que haya sido seleccionada. El reporte final SEIS/SEIR atenderá los comentarios del público y agencias, así como las preocupaciones sobre el Borrador del reporte, y el registro de la decisión y el aviso de determinación concluirán el proceso de revisión. En este punto, el proceso para el desarrollo del proyecto continuará hacia el diseño final y la construcción del proyecto.

Costos del Proyecto
El costo estimado del proyecto del LRT incluyendo planeación y trabajos preliminares de ingeniería es de $1.2 billones. El costo de adquisición del derecho de vía a la fecha es de aproximadamente $20 millones.

Estatus de Fondos
El Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast ha sido identificado como un proyecto de alta prioridad en SANDAG y es parte del Programa de Acciones a Corto Plazo de TransNet. TransNet aportará el 50 por ciento del costo de capital del proyecto, anticipando que el restante 50 por ciento provendrá del programa de Nuevos Comienzos (New Starts) de la Sección 5309 de FTA. A la fecha, la región de San Diego ha invertido un total de $32.1 millones en la planeación del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast, los trabajos preliminares de ingeniería y la adquisición del derecho de vía.

Resumen
El Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast es un proyecto de transporte público de la más alta prioridad para SANDAG. Este ofrecerá acceso a áreas de empleo, educación y residenciales que están creciendo. El LRT, el cual será una extensión del Trolley de San Diego, funciona particularmente bien en este corredor porque:

- Conecta con el sistema de trenes existente en el Centro de Transporte Old Town;
- Ofrece el traslado completo (sin transferencias) entre el downtown San Diego y University City, incluyendo centros importantes de actividades como son UCSD, UTC y Old Town; y
- El tren ligero (LRT) puede dar servicio a mucha gente para eventos masivos especiales en downtown San Diego y Mission Valley.

Involúcrrese
SANDAG se ha embarcado en un esfuerzo integral de acercamiento con el público para comunicar la información acerca del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast y para tener oportunidades para retroalimentación durante el proceso de revisión medioambiental.

- Visite www.sandag.org/midcoast para información actualizada del proyecto
- Subscribase al boletín E-mail por Internet
- Participe en las Reuniones de Sondeo
- Asista a las reuniones públicas de SANDAG
- Ofrezca comentarios por escrito
- Solicite una presentación para su grupo vecinal o asociación cívica comunicándose a midcoast@sandag.org o al (619) 595-5620
YOU ARE INVITED . . .

HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center north to the University City community, serving major destinations including Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC) shopping mall, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and downtown San Diego.

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase of project development, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project will begin on May 3, 2010, and continue through June 1, 2010. Five open house Scoping Meetings will be held in locations throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor: SANDAG/Downtown, Caltrans District 11/Old Town, western Clairemont, University City and UCSD. These meetings are open to the public and will provide a forum for comments and input to be received on the project. Notice and specific details for these meetings is listed on the reverse side of this card. Find out more about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project at www.sandag.org/midcoast.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the Scoping Meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5620 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request materials in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
YOU ARE INVITED . . .
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

SANDAG welcomes your participation in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Mark your calendar and plan on attending a meeting near where you live or work.

Wednesday, May 5, 2010
SANDAG — Board Room (7th Floor)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit stations located at
4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Trolley Station.

Tuesday, May 11, 2010
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92039
3 to 6 p.m.
Bus stop located at Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. on UCSD campus.

Wednesday, May 12, 2010
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at
Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

Thursday, May 20, 2010
Clairemont High School
Cafeteria
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

Tuesday, May 25, 2010
Caltrans District 11 Office
Garcia Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit station located at
Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

www.sandag.org/midcoast
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center north to the University City community, serving major destinations including Westfield University Town Centre (UTC) shopping mall, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and downtown San Diego.

SANDAG wants to hear from you … Come learn about the project and provide your input during the Scoping Period, which will run from May 3, 2010, through June 1, 2010.

Please join us at one of five open house Scoping Meetings in locations throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor. Come anytime during the Scoping Meetings to review information and provide comments. Comments will be accepted through June 1, 2010 via fax at (619) 699-1905, via e-mail at midcoast@sandag.org, or by mail to SANDAG, Attn: Mid-Coast Comments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

Wednesday, May 5, 2010
SANDAG
Board Room (7th Floor)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit stations located at 4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Trolley Station.

Tuesday, May 11, 2010
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA  92037
3 to 6 p.m.
Bus stop located at Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. on UCSD campus.

Wednesday, May 12, 2010
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

Thursday, May 20, 2010
Clairemont High School
Cafeteria
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

Tuesday, May 25, 2010
Caltrans District 11 Office
Gallegos Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit station located at Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

For more information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, please visit www.sandag.org/midcoast.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the Scoping Meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5620 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request materials in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
El Proyecto del Corredor Mid-Coast de SANDAG extenderá el servicio de transporte público desde el Centro de Transporte Público de Old Town al norte hasta la comunidad de University City, dando servicio a importantes destinos como el centro comercial Westfield University Town Centre (UTC), La Universidad de California, San Diego (UCSD) y el downtown San Diego.

SANDAG quiere escuchar su opinión … Se buscan comentarios públicos durante el período de alcance público, el cual va desde el 3 de mayo al 1 de junio de 2010.

Por favor considere ir a una de las cinco Reuniones Públicas en ubicaciones a lo largo del corredor Mid-Coast. Conozca más del proyecto y dé sus comentarios. Se aceptarán comentarios hasta 1 de junio de 2010, vía fax al (619) 699-1905, vía e-mail al midcoast@sandag.org, o por correo a la atención del Mid-Coast Comments, en SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

Miércoles 5 de mayo de 2010
SANDAG
Board Room (Piso 7)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús/Estación de Transporte público en 4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Estación del Trolley.

Martes 11 de mayo de 2010
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA, 92037
3 a 6 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. en el UCSD campus.

Miércoles 12 de mayo de 2010
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

Jueves 20 de mayo de 2010
Clairemont High School
Cafetería
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús ubicada en Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

Martes 25 de mayo de 2010
Caltrans District 11 Office
Gallegos Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 a 7 p.m.
Parada de autobús/Estación de Transporte Público ubicadas en Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

Para más información acerca del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast, por favor visite www.sandag.org/midcoast.

En cumplimiento con la ley Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las Reuniones Públicas enlistadas arriba. Si requiriera tal asistencia, por favor comuníquese a SANDAG al (619) 595-5620 con al menos 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en un formato alternativo, por favor llame al (619) 895-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), o por fax al (619) 699-1905.
PROJECT PURPOSE & NEED

- Expand transportation capacity
- Provide alternatives to congested highways and roadways
- Complement and integrate with existing transit system
- Minimize dependence on auto travel
- Increase reliability and reduce transit travel times
- Serve UCSD and University City effectively
- Support regional policies in the Regional Transportation Plan: Livability, Sustainability, Equity
MID-COAST CORRIDOR
TRANSIT PROJECT STUDY AREA

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
March 2010
Study Area
Trolley - Green Line
Trolley - Blue Line
COASTER Line
Trolley Station
COASTER Station
Transit Center

SANDAG
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM)**
  Regional Transportation Plan “Revenue Constrained” scenario with limited capital investment to improve existing transit system

- **Light Rail Transit** —
  7 alternatives considered
  Electrically powered trolley service that operates on exclusive tracks

- **Bus Rapid Transit** —
  4 alternatives considered
  Branded bus service that operates primarily in semi-exclusive lanes or fixed guideways

- **Commuter Rail** —
  1 alternative considered
  Diesel powered rail service that operates on tracks shared with intercity and freight trains
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>All Transit System Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems Management</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
<td>18,000 – 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>2,000 – 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FTA Cost Effectiveness Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL CAPITAL COST (1,000s)</th>
<th>ANNUAL USER BENEFITS (Hours)</th>
<th>COST EFFECTIVENESS (Cost Per Benefit Hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>$62,066</td>
<td>725,291</td>
<td>$16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 1</td>
<td>$1,188,290</td>
<td>3,570,752</td>
<td>$24.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 2</td>
<td>$1,227,343</td>
<td>3,503,232</td>
<td>$26.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 3</td>
<td>$1,247,592</td>
<td>3,412,197</td>
<td>$26.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 4</td>
<td>$1,220,133</td>
<td>3,622,859</td>
<td>$24.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 5</td>
<td>$1,175,235</td>
<td>3,640,155</td>
<td>$23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 6</td>
<td>$1,165,966</td>
<td>3,556,357</td>
<td>$24.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT 7</td>
<td>$1,061,775</td>
<td>3,214,240</td>
<td>$24.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 1</td>
<td>$2,111,496</td>
<td>876,992</td>
<td>$184.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 2</td>
<td>$1,128,883</td>
<td>370,629</td>
<td>$251.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 3</td>
<td>$745,030</td>
<td>187,627</td>
<td>$371.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 4</td>
<td>$1,045,013</td>
<td>434,149</td>
<td>$208.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$1,170,591</td>
<td>619,680</td>
<td>$135.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Need</th>
<th>TSM</th>
<th>LRT 1</th>
<th>LRT 2</th>
<th>LRT 3</th>
<th>LRT 4</th>
<th>LRT 5</th>
<th>LRT 6</th>
<th>LRT 7</th>
<th>BRT 1</th>
<th>BRT 2</th>
<th>BRT 3</th>
<th>BRT 4</th>
<th>CRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness in Goal Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increase the overall capacity of the transportation system serving the study area</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reduce auto-person trips and VMT and VHT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Link study area transit services with existing transit facilities and services to improve regional connectivity and mobility</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increase transit ridership and mode share</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increase transit on-time performance</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reduce the disparity between highway and transit speeds and travel times</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Provide fast and efficient transit service to the University City area</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Provide direct transit connections to the UCSD West Campus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Provide high capacity and quality transit service to those parts of the study area with existing or planned density and other transit friendly characteristics</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Help shape local land use planning to help foster TOD near stations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Maintain consistency with regional and local plans</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Reduce GHG emissions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Limit impacts to sensitive habitats</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Improve access for low-income, minority, elderly, and disabled persons</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Avoid adverse impacts to low-income, minority, elderly, and disabled persons</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Potential environmental impacts</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Potential local traffic impacts</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* FTA Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Additional funding required above the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Likelihood of securing FTA New Starts funding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- More effective
- Less effective
ALTERNATIVES FOR SCOPING

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
April 2010

Alternatives for Scoping
- LRT – Alternative 1 (Combines 1, 4, and 5)
- LRT – Alternative 3
- LRT – Alternative 6
- Trolley Station
- *UCSD East location differs by alignment
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GOALS OF THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

· Build awareness about the project and its importance to regional mobility

· Provide up-to-date project information

· Offer opportunities for public input to the decision-making process

· Meet public involvement requirements of CEQA, NEPA, FTA, and SANDAG

· Involve a broad range of stakeholders

· Address social equity and environmental justice issues
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- Visit www.sandag.org/midcoast or call (619) 595-5620
- Subscribe to the E-mail Newsletter
- Participate in Scoping Meetings
- Attend SANDAG public meetings
- Provide written comments
- Request a presentation
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are preparing a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego, California. FTA is serving as lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and SANDAG is serving as lead agency for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Scoping Information Brochure provides information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the scoping process and its relationship to subsequent project development milestones.

**PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The Draft SEIS/SEIR will build upon and update previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decisions for the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Draft SEIS/SEIR will include an analysis of changed conditions in the Mid-Coast Corridor since the previous environmental studies were completed.

The Mid-Coast Corridor LRT Project is included in the 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (RTP) (SANDAG 2007) under both the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios. TransNet will provide funding for 50 percent of the project’s capital cost, with the remaining 50 percent anticipated to come from the FTA Section 5309 New Starts program. Securing these funds will require successfully completing the FTA New Starts requirements.

**SCOPING**

In the scoping process, SANDAG will inform the public and involved agencies about the project. It will describe the transportation problems and needs to be addressed in the Mid-Coast Corridor, the alternatives under consideration, the criteria to be used for evaluating the alternatives, and the environmental issues to be studied. The goal of scoping is to encourage active two-way communication of issues and concerns to help shape the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

The alternatives recommended to be carried forward, and the alternatives recommended for elimination, will be presented for review and comment at scoping. Once all comments have been considered, the SANDAG Board of Directors and FTA will make a final decision on the alternatives to be carried forward for further evaluation in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

**Purpose and Need for the Project**

The purpose and need for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project focuses on improving mobility and accessibility and attracting transit-supportive land uses and economic development to smart growth centers in the Mid-Coast Corridor.

The study area for the project, shown in Figure 1 extends from OTTC on the south to the I-5/Interstate 805 (I-805) interchange on the north, and is bound by the Pacific Ocean on the west and the I-805 and State Route 163 (SR 163) on the east. More broadly, the term “Mid-Coast Corridor” refers to a larger geographic area that includes not only the project study area but also Downtown San Diego and the area between downtown and Old Town.
Description of the Mid-Coast Corridor

The Mid-Coast Corridor is anchored by University City on the north and Downtown San Diego on the south. University City is a designated Urban Center and mixed-use core and has the second most dense land uses in San Diego County. In addition to the UCSD campus, the Westfield UTC shopping center, and four regional hospitals, the University City area contains several high-density residential developments and is a significant employment center for the region with numerous high- and mid-rise office developments in the vicinity of UTC. Downtown San Diego, at the south end of the Mid-Coast Corridor, is the region’s only identified Metropolitan Center, and has the region’s densest land uses and high-rise development.

Significant growth is projected in the Mid-Coast Corridor. By 2030, SANDAG projects that the Mid-Coast Corridor’s population will exceed a quarter million, 14 percent more than in 2003. Employment in the corridor also is projected to increase by 14 percent, to almost 200,000 jobs. Increased population and employment will lead to increased travel demand in the corridor. Additionally, the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) (SANDAG 2004) identified for both the Downtown San Diego and University City areas as places of high residential and employment densities.

The SANDAG RTP envisions that these dense population and employment centers at both the northern and southern ends of the corridor will be served by improved transit. This improved system would attract new transit riders with service that has greater frequency, speed, and reliability than is possible with the current system composed of buses, commuter rail, and LRT extending only to the OTTC. The existing COASTER commuter rail service has widely spaced stations and therefore, provides limited service to the specific areas of transit opportunity within the study area. The speed and reliability of bus service are hindered by roadway congestion. With increased congestion projected to occur in the
future, the level of service, reliability, and efficiency of the existing transit system will decrease, with no additional priority improvements for transit.

**Goals and Objectives**

The SANDAG RTP was developed to meet the region's long-term mobility needs, better connect transportation and land use policy decisions, and create a transportation network that will serve the people of this region well into the 21st century. Adopted by SANDAG in 2007, the RTP specifies seven policy objectives to guide the further planning and development of the transportation system: Livability, Mobility, Efficiency, Accessibility, Reliability, Sustainability, and Equity.

The Mid-Coast Corridor’s current transportation system does not satisfactorily meet these RTP policy objectives. To enhance the performance of the transportation system, the needs listed in Table 1 have been identified. Project goals have been established to help identify alternatives that address these needs and to guide the evaluation of these alternatives. Further objectives were established to account for other regional policy objectives that were not fully reflected in the project need, but have a bearing on the evaluation (Table 2).

**Table 1. Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Need</th>
<th>Project Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Capacity Needs to be Expanded</td>
<td>Increase the overall capacity of the transportation system serving the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to Congested Highways and Roadways Need to be Provided</td>
<td>Reduce auto-person trips and vehicles miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements that Complement and Integrate With Existing Transit Systems Need to be Provided</td>
<td>Link study area transit services with existing transit facilities and services to improve regional connectivity and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Improvements that Minimize Dependence on Auto Travel Need to be Provided</td>
<td>Increase transit ridership and mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs to be Reliable and Competitive with the Auto Travel Time</td>
<td>Increase transit on-time performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the disparity between highway and transit speeds and travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs to Effectively Serve the UCSD and University City Areas</td>
<td>Provide fast and efficient transit service to the University City area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide direct transit connections to the UCSD West Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs to Better Support -- and be Supported by -- Planned Development and Growth in the Corridor</td>
<td>Provide high-capacity and quality transit service to those parts of the study area with existing or planned density and other transit friendly characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help shape local land use planning to help foster transit-oriented development (TOD) near stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. SANDAG Regional Policy Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livability: Focus transit investments in areas with compatible land uses that support an efficient transit system</td>
<td>Maintain consistency with regional and local plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: Improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions</td>
<td>Reduce GHG emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit potential impacts to sensitive habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity: Provide equitable levels of transportation service and avoid disparate impacts</td>
<td>Improve access for low-income, minority, elderly, and disabled persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid adverse impacts to low-income, minority, elderly, and disabled persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives Evaluated in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report

The first step in preparing the Draft SEIS/SEIR was the development and evaluation of alternatives for public and agency consideration during CEQA scoping. The corridor’s transportation needs were defined, and transit alternatives were identified for meeting these needs. These alternatives were evaluated against the project goals, objectives, and criteria. The Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report summarizes this process, presents the evaluation results, and recommends a smaller set of alternatives for consideration in CEQA scoping.

The evaluation considered a No-Build Alternative and several build alternatives consisting of a relatively low-cost TSM Alternative, seven LRT alternatives, four BRT alternatives, and one Commuter Rail Alternative. In identifying the range of alternatives, consideration was given to changed conditions since the previous LPA was adopted in 1995 and updated in 2003. Alternative alignments also were identified from stakeholder input from UCSD, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), North County Transit District (NCTD) and the City of San Diego.

Alternatives Proposed for Scoping

The SANDAG Board approved three LRT alternatives and the No Build Alternative for presentation at scoping (Figure 2). Each LRT alternative would extend the existing Trolley system from OTTC north to University City, with service to UCSD and UTC. The No Build Alternative is required by NEPA and CEQA, and it will serve as the basis for comparing environmental impacts in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. At the conclusion of scoping, the SANDAG Board will make a final decision on what alternatives to include in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. A brief discussion of each alternative is provided below.

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative includes existing transit services and the highway and transit improvements from the RTP Revenue Constrained Scenario (i.e. improvements for which funding can be reasonably expected.) Within the Mid-Coast Corridor, the major capital improvement projects in the No-Build Alternative (and in each of the other alternatives) are listed below:

- HOV lanes on I-5, from Interstate 8 (I-8) north to I-805 and beyond, with Direct Access Ramps (DARs) at Voigt Drive
- HOV lanes on I-805, from I-5 to Carroll Canyon Road, and Managed Lanes on I-805, from Carroll Canyon Road to South Bay with DARs at Carroll Canyon Road and Nobel Drive
- Double tracking the SDNR tracks within the MTS/SDNR right-of-way
Figure 2. LRT Alternatives Recommended for Scoping
In addition to these capital improvements, transit operating improvements are included in the No-Build Alternative. These include modifying the existing Route 150 of the MTS bus system, which operates between Downtown San Diego and University City. The modified route would operate within the planned I-5 HOV lanes, from OTTC north to Nobel Drive, and would serve UCSD and UTC with 15-minute service during peak periods and 30-minute service during the mid-day or off-peak period.

Improvements to the existing Trolley service also are included in the RTP Revenue Constrained Scenario. Based on the RTP, the No-Build Alternative provides for 7.5-minute service all day on all lines except the Trolley Orange Line, which would provide 7.5-minute service during peak periods and 15-minute service during the off-peak period.

**Light Rail Transit Alternatives**

Three LRT alternatives are being presented during scoping for extending the Trolley system from OTTC north to University City. These include LRT alternatives 1 (combines 1, 4 and 5), 3 and 6. Each alternative would use the existing Trolley tracks from the Santa Fe Depot north past OTTC, to a point just south of the San Diego River. From there, the alternatives would follow the MTS/San Diego Northern Railway (SDNR) right-of-way to a point just north of SR 52 in University City. Stations would be located within the MTS/SDNR right-of-way along Morena Boulevard at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue.

LRT Alternative 1 is a refinement of LPA adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2003. North of SR 52, this alternative would follow the I-5 corridor north to the UCSD West Campus, follow Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue and continue to the terminal station at the UTC Transit Center. Stations would be located at Nobel Drive, UCSD West, UCSD East, Executive Drive, and the UTC Transit Center. Alternative 1 includes three alignment options on or adjacent to Voigt Drive. The first option would be aligned at-grade on Voigt Drive. The second option would provide an aerial alignment along the south side of Voigt Drive, while the third option would provide for an alignment just to the south of Voigt Drive.

LRT Alternative 3 was developed to avoid potential conflicts with the planned I-5 widening to accommodate the future HOV lanes. Although it was evaluated in the 1995 AA/DEIS/DEIR, the planned I-5 widening merited its reconsideration. Unlike the other LRT alternatives, LRT Alternative 3 would follow the existing MTS/SDNR right-of-way east to Genesee Avenue. At this point, LRT Alternative 3 would exit the MTS/SDNR right-of-way and transition below grade (via a new tunnel), which would proceed north under Genesee Avenue and then turn west under Executive Drive, rising to grade west of Regents Road on the UCSD East Campus. The alternative would continue west, with a terminal station on the UCSD West Campus. Within University City, this alternative would include a below-grade station at the UTC Transit Center and at-grade stations at UCSD East (at Thornton Hospital) and UCSD West. This alternative would minimize right-of-way acquisitions by using the existing MTS/SDNR right-of-way east to Genesee Avenue.

LRT Alternative 6 is similar to Alternative 1, but it would avoid Voigt Drive by leaving the UCSD West Campus and crossing over to the east side of I-5 south of Voigt Drive. On the UCSD East Campus, this alternative would include a station at Thornton Hospital instead of on Voigt Drive.

Each of the LRT alternatives would operate as an extension of the Trolley Blue Line to University City. The extended Blue Line would operate as a single line from the existing San Ysidro Transit Center Station on the south to University City on the north, with stops at all intermediate stations. The LRT line would provide 7.5-minute service during peak and off-peak periods. By extending the Trolley Blue Line to University City, the LRT alternatives would connect the major travel markets in University City with Downtown San Diego, South San Diego, and South Bay without a transfer.
ENVIROMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The types of impacts to be evaluated in the SEIS/SEIR include:

- Transportation
- Lane use, zoning, and economic development
- Land acquisition, displacements, and relocations
- Parklands/recreation areas and cultural resources (including historical, archeological, and paleontological resources)
- Neighborhood compatibility and environmental justice
- Visual and aesthetic impacts
- Natural resources (including air quality, noise and vibration, wetlands, water resources, geology/soils, and hazardous materials)
- Energy use
- Safety and security
- Wildlife and ecosystems (including endangered species)
- Indirect and cumulative development effects

The evaluation of impacts will be summarized in a Draft SEIS/SEIR document which will be circulated for public and agency comment. A public hearing will be held to present the results documented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR and to hear all comments. A Final SEIS/SEIR will then be prepared to update and document any changes made as a result of comments received during circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The Final SEIS/SEIR will also identify measures to mitigate any adverse effects identified.

PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010/Summer 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Summer 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013/Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2015/Winter 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Process</td>
<td>Preparation of Draft SEIS/SEIR</td>
<td>Draft SEIS/SEIR</td>
<td>Final SEIS/SEIR</td>
<td>Final Design/Construction</td>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

SANDAG invites all interested individuals and organizations, public agencies, and Native American Tribes to comment on the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including the project’s purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied, and the impacts to be evaluated. Comments should focus on alternatives that may be less costly or have less environmental or community impacts while achieving similar transportation objectives, and the identification of any significant social, economic, or environmental issues relating to the alternatives.

Scoping Meeting Schedule

Wednesday, May 5, 2010
SANDAG
Board Room (7th Floor)
401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit stations located at
4th/B St. & 5th Ave. Trolley Station.

Thursday, May 20, 2010
Clairemont High School
Cafeteria
4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.

Tuesday, May 11, 2010
University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Price Center East Ballroom
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093
3 to 6 p.m.
Bus stop located at Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. on UCSD campus.

Tuesday, May 25, 2010
Caltrans District 11 Office
Garcia Conference Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop/Transit station located at
Taylor St./Juan St. & Old Town Transit Center.

Wednesday, May 12, 2010
Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
Garfield Theatre
4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037
4 to 7 p.m.
Bus stop located at Executive Dr./Regents Rd.

Project informational materials will be available at the Scoping meetings and on the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org/midcoast ). Copies of the materials can also be obtained by contacting midcoast@sandag.org or (619) 595-5620.

Comments on the proposed scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR can be submitted in person, either verbally or in writing, at any of the five Scoping Meetings. Written comments can also be provided via U.S. mail or email on or before June 1, 2010.

Mail to: Mid-Coast Comments
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Fax to: (619) 699-1905

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in the Scoping meetings listed above. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5620 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request materials in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
La Administración Federal de Transporte Público (Federal Transit Administration, FTA) y la Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés) están preparando el Borrador del suplemento del Enunciado de Impacto Ambiental /Subsiguiente Reporte de Impacto Ambiental (SEIS/SEIR, por sus siglas en inglés) para el Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast en San Diego, California. FTA es la agencia líder para la ley National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) y SANDAG es la agencia líder para la ley California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

El Folleto de Información de Sondeo (Scoping) ofrece información acerca del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast, del proceso de sondeo y su relación con el desarrollo de subsiguientes hitos.

**ANTECEDENTES DEL PROYECTO**

El Borrador del SEIS/SEIR se hará basado en actualizaciones previas de planeación de transporte público, de ingeniería, así como en estudios medioambientales y decisiones sobre el corredor Mid-Coast. El Borrador del SEIS/SEIR incluirá un análisis de cambio de condiciones en el Corredor Mid-Coast desde que fueron terminados los estudios ambientales anteriores.

El Proyecto de Tren Ligero (LRT, por sus siglas en inglés) del Corredor Mid-Coast está incluido en el Plan Regional de Transporte de San Diego 2030: Rutas hacia el futuro (RTP, por sus siglas en inglés) (SANDAG 2007) bajo los escenarios de Recaudación Restringida o de Expectativa Razonable de Ganancias. TransNet dará el 50 por ciento de los fondos requeridos para el proyecto, considerando que el restante 50 por ciento vendrá de los programas para nuevos proyectos de la Sección 5309 de la FTA. Asegurar esos fondos requerirá concluir exitosamente los requisitos para nuevos proyectos de FTA (New Starts).

**SONDEO**

En el proceso de sondeo (Scoping), SANDAG informará al público y agencias involucradas acerca del proyecto. Describirá los problemas y necesidad de transporte que serán atendidas en el Corredor Mid-Coast, las alternativas consideradas, el criterio usado para evaluar las alternativas y los asuntos medioambientales que serán estudiados. La meta del sondeo es promover una activa comunicación en ambas direcciones sobre los asuntos y preocupaciones, para ayudar a darles forma al sondeo del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR.

Las alternativas que se recomienden para avanzar, así como las que se recomienden para ser eliminadas, serán presentadas para su revisión y comentarios durante el sondeo. Una vez que sean considerados todos los comentarios, la Mesa Directiva de SANDAG y FTA tomarán la decisión final de las alternativas que deberán avanzar para su mayor evaluación en el Borrador del SEIS/SEIR.

**Propósito y Necesidad del Proyecto**

El propósito y necesidad del Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast se enfoca en mejorar la movilidad y en los usos de suelo favorables al transporte público, así como el desarrollo económico para el crecimiento inteligente en áreas del Corredor Mid-Coast.

El área de estudio del proyecto, como se muestra en la Figura 1, se extiende desde el Centro de Transporte de Old Town (OTTC, por sus siglas en inglés) al sur, hasta la intersección de la I-5/Interestatal 805 (I-805) al norte, del Océano Pacífico al oeste, a la I-805 y la Ruta Estatal 163 (SR 163) al este. De manera más amplia, el término “Corredor Mid-Coast” se refiere a una área geográfica mayor que incluye no únicamente el área de estudio, sino también el Downtown San Diego y el área entre el downtown y Old Town.
El Corredor Mid-Coast está anclado en University City al norte y en el Downtown San Diego al sur. University City está designado como un Centro Urbano con usos mixtos y sus usos de suelo tienen el segundo lugar en mayor densidad en el Condado de San Diego. Además del campus de UCSD, el centro comercial Westfield UTC y cuatro hospitales regionales, el área de University City tiene varios desarrollos residenciales de alta densidad y es un importante centro de empleos en la región, con numerosos desarrollos de edificios de oficinas de gran y mediana altura aledaños a UTC. Downtown San Diego, en el extremo sur del Corredor Mid-Coast, es el único Centro Metropolitano identificado en la región y tiene el uso de suelo con mayor densidad y desarrollos de gran altura.

Se proyecta un importante crecimiento en el Corredor Mid-Coast. Para el 2030, SANDAG proyecta que la población en el Corredor Mid-Coast exceda al cuarto de millón, 14 por ciento más que en 2003. Se proyecta también que los empleos en el corredor aumenten un 14 por ciento, casi 200,000 trabajos. Más población y empleos resultarán en un incremento en la demanda de transporte en el corredor. Adicionalmente, el Plan Integral Regional de SANDAG (RCP, por sus siglas en inglés) (SANDAG 2004) identificó que tanto las áreas de Downtown San Diego y University City son lugares de alta densidad residencial y de empleos.

El RTP de SANDAG considera que ambas áreas densas en población y empleo al norte y sur del corredor habrán de contar con mejor servicio de transporte público. Este mejor sistema de transporte atraerá nuevos pasajeros con un servicio que ofrecerá mayor frecuencia, velocidad y confiabilidad que el actual sistema compuesto por autobuses, tren suburbano (commuter) y tren ligero (LRT) que llega hasta OTTC. El actual tren suburbano COASTER tiene estaciones muy espaciadas y por lo tanto, ofrece un servicio limitado a ciertas áreas con oportunidades para el transporte público en el área de
La velocidad y confiabilidad del servicio de autobús se dificulta por el congestionamiento en carreteras. Con el creciente congestionamiento anticipado para el futuro, el nivel de servicio, confiabilidad y eficiencia del actual sistema de transporte público decaerá, sin contar con mejoras prioritarias al transporte público.

**Metas y Objetivos**

El RTP de SANDAG se desarrolló para satisfacer las necesidades de movilidad a largo plazo en la región, conectar mejor las decisiones en política de transporte y de usos de suelo, y crear una red de transporte público que sirva a la población de la región ya entrados en el siglo 21. Aprobado por SANDAG en 2007, el RTP especifica siete objetivos de política para guiar la planeación y desarrollo del sistema de transporte: Habitabilidad, Movilidad, Eficiencia, Accesibilidad, Confiabilidad, Sustentabilidad y Equidad.

El actual sistema de transporte público del Corredor Mid-Coast no cumple satisfactoriamente esas metas de los objetivos de políticas del RTP. Para ampliar el desempeño del sistema de transporte, se han identificado las necesidades enlistadas en la Tabla 1. Las metas del proyecto se establecieron para ayudar a identificar alternativas que atiendan esas necesidades y para guiar la evaluación de esas alternativas. Se establecieron más objetivos para cumplir con otros objetivos de política regional que no estaban completamente reflejados en la necesidad del proyecto, pero tienen peso en la evaluación (Tabla 2).
### Tabla 1. Metas del Proyecto del Corredor Mid-Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necesidad del Proyecto</th>
<th>Metas del Proyecto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necesita Ampliarse la Capacidad de Transporte</td>
<td>Aumentar la capacidad total del sistema de transporte que ofrece servicio en el área de estudio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necesita Ofrecerse Alternativas a las Autopistas y Caminos Congestionados</td>
<td>Reducir viajes auto-persona y millas recorridas por vehículos (VMT, por sus siglas en inglés) y horas recorridas por vehículos (VHT, por sus siglas en inglés)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necesita Ofrecerse Mejoras que Complementen y se Integren con el Sistema de Transporte Existente</td>
<td>Enlazar los servicios de transporte público en las áreas de estudio con las instalaciones y servicios existentes de transporte público, para mejorar la conectividad y movilidad regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necesita Ofrecerse Mejoras al Transporte Público que Minimicen la Dependencia en Translados en Auto</td>
<td>Aumentar el aforo de viajeros en transporte público y modalidades compartidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Transporte Público Necesita Ser Confiable y Competitivo comparado con el Tiempo de Translado en Auto</td>
<td>Aumentar el desempeño y puntualidad del transporte público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Transporte Público Necesita Dar Servicio Efectivo en las Areas de UCSD y University City</td>
<td>Reducir la diferencia entre tiempos y velocidad de recorrido entre carreteras y el transporte público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Transporte Público Necesita Apoyar Mejor al – y Ser Apoyado por – Desarrollo y Crecimiento Planificado del Corredor</td>
<td>Ofrecer un rápido y eficiente servicio de transporte público en el área de University City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ofrecer conexiones directas de transporte público con UCSD West Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ofrecer un servicio de alta capacidad y calidad a aquellas partes en el área de estudio con densidad existente o planeada y otras características amigables al transporte público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayudar a darle forma a la planeación local de usos de suelo para favorecer desarrollos orientados al transporte público (TOD, por sus siglas en inglés) cercanos a las estaciones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tabla 2. Objetivos de Política Regional de SANDAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metas Regionales</th>
<th>Objetivos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitabilidad: Enfocar las inversiones de transporte público en áreas con usos de suelo compatible que apoyen un sistema de transporte eficiente</td>
<td>Mantener consistencia con los planes locales y regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustentabilidad: Mejorar la calidad de aire y reducir emisiones de GEI</td>
<td>Reducir emisiones de GEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitar impactos potenciales a habitats sensibles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equidad: Ofrecer niveles de servicio de transporte equitativos y evitar impactos dispares</td>
<td>Mejorar el acceso a personas de bajos ingresos, minorías, mayores de edad y discapacitados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evitar impactos adversos a personas de bajos ingresos, minorías, mayores de edad y discapacitados</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternativas Evaluadas en el Borrador del Reporte de Evaluación Comparativa de Alternativas

El primer paso en la preparación del Borrador SEIS/SEIR fue el desarrollo y evaluación de las alternativas para la consideración del público y la agencia durante el sondeo de CEQA. Se definieron las necesidades de transporte del corredor y se identificaron las alternativas que cubrían esas necesidades. Esas alternativas fueron evaluadas conforme las metas, objetivos y criterios del proyecto. El Borrador del Reporte de Evaluación Comparativa de Alternativas resume este proceso, presenta los resultados de la evaluación y recomienda un grupo menor de alternativas para su consideración en el sondeo de CEQA.

La evaluación considera la alternativa de No Construir y varias alternativas de construcción consistentes en una alternativa de bajo costo TSM, siete alternativas de tren ligero (LRT), cuatro alternativas BRT, y una alternativa de Tren Suburbano (Commuter). Al identificar alternativas, se consideró el cambio de condiciones entre el anterior LPA aprobado en 1995 y actualizado en 2003. También se identificaron alternativas para el trazo con retroalimentación de partes interesadas como UCSD, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), el Departamento de Transporte de California (Caltrans), North County Transit District (NCTD) y la Ciudad de San Diego.

Alternativas Propuestas para el Sondeo

La Directiva de SANDAG aprobó tres alternativas LRT y una de No Construcción para presentarse en el sondeo (Figura 2). Cada alternativa LRT extendería el actual sistema del Trolley desde OTTC al norte hasta University City, con servicio a UCSD y UTC. La alternativa de No Construcción es requerida por NEPA y CEQA, y dará servicio en base a la comparación de impactos del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR. Al terminar el sondeo, la Directiva de SANDAG tomará una decisión final sobre cuáles alternativas será incluidas en el Borrador SEIS/SEIR. A continuación se presentan breves descripciones de cada alternativa.

Alternativa de No-Construcción

La Alternativa de No-Construcción incluye los servicios de transporte público existentes y las mejoras al transporte público y autopistas dentro del escenario de Recaudación Restringida del RTP (ej. mejoras en las cuales el financiamiento está dentro de una expectativa razonable.) Enlistados abajo se encuentran las mayores mejoras de capital dentro del Corredor Mid-Coast en la Alternativa de No Construcción:

- Carriles HOV en la I-5, desde la Interestatal 8 (I-8) al norte hasta la I-805 y más allá, con Rampas de Acceso Directo (DAR, por sus siglas en inglés) en Voigt Drive
- Carriles HOV en I-805, desde I-5 hasta Carroll Canyon Road, y carriles flexibles (Managed Lanes) en I-805, desde Carroll Canyon Road hasta el Sur de la Bahía con DARs en Carroll Canyon Road y Nobel Drive
- Doble vía del SDNR dentro del derecho de vía de MTS/SDNR
Figura 2. Alternativas LRT Recomendadas para el Sondeo
Adicionalmente a esas mejoras de capital, se incluyen mejoras operativas dentro de la Alternativa de No Construcción. Estas incluyen modificaciones a la actual Ruta 150 del sistema de autobuses de MTS, la cual opera entre el Downtown San Diego y University City. La ruta modificada operaría dentro de los carriles HOV de la I-5 en planes, desde OTTC al norte hasta Nobel Drive, y daría servicio a UCSD y UTC cada 15-minutos en períodos pico, y cada 30-minutos durante el día o en períodos no pico.

También se incluyen mejoras al servicio del Trolley en el Escenario de Recaudación Restringida del RTP. Basados en el RTP, la Alternativa de No Construcción ofrece servicio cada 7.5-minutos todo el día en todas las líneas, excepto la Línea Anaranjada del Trolley, que ofrecería servicio cada 7.5-minutos en períodos pico y cada 15-minutos en períodos no pico.

**Alternativas para un Tren Ligero (Light Rail Transit o LRT)**

En el sondeo están siendo presentadas tres alternativas LRT para extender el sistema del Trolley desde OTTC al norte hasta University City. Se incluye las alternativas de LRT 1 (que combina 1, 4 y 5), 3 y 6. Cada alternativa usaría las vías existentes del Trolley desde Santa Fe Depot al norte, pasando por OTTC, a un punto al sur del Río San Diego. De allí, las alternativas seguirían el derecho de vía de los trenes de MTS/San Diego Northern Railway (SDNR) hasta un punto al norte de la SR 52 en University City. Las estaciones estarían ubicadas dentro del derecho de vía de MTS/SDNR a lo largo de Morena Boulevard hasta Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive y Balboa Avenue.

La Alternativa 1 de LRT es una nueva versión del LPA aprobado por la mesa Directiva de SANDAG en 2003. Al norte de la SR 52, esta alternativa seguiría el corredor I-5 hasta UCSD West Campus, siguiendo Voigt Drive hasta Genesee Avenue y continuando hasta la estación terminal en el Centro de Transporte de UTC. Las estaciones estarían ubicadas en Nobel Drive, UCSD West, UCSD East, Executive Drive, y en el Centro de Transporte de UTC. La Alternativa 1 incluye tres opciones para el trazo en o adyacente a Voigt Drive. La primera opción consideraría el trazo a nivel en Voigt Drive. La segunda opción consideraría un trazo volado a lo largo del lado sur de Voigt Drive, mientras que la tercera opción consideraría un trazo al sur de Voigt Drive.

La Alternativa 3 de LRT fue desarrollada para evitar posibles conflictos con los planes de ampliación del I-5 que daría espacio a futuros carriles HOV. Aunque fue evaluada en el AA/DEIS/DEIR de 1995, los planes de ampliación de la I-5 ameritaban su reconsideración. A diferencia de otras alternativas LRT, la Alternativa 3 de LRT seguiría el actual derecho de vía MTS/SDNR al este de Genesee Avenue. En este punto, la Alternativa 3 de LRT saldría del derecho de vía de MTS/SDNR y cambiaría abajo de nivel (vía un túnel), que proseguiría al norte debajo de Genesee Avenue y voltearía al oeste debajo de Executive Drive, elevándose a nivel al oeste de Regents Road en el UCSD East Campus. La Alternativa continuaría al oeste, con una estación terminal en UCSD West Campus. Dentro de University City, esta alternativa incluiría una estación por debajo del nivel en el Centro de Transporte de UTC y estaciones a nivel en UCSD East (en el Hospital Thornton) y UCSD West. Esta alternativa minimizaría la adquisición de derechos de vía al usar el actual derecho de vía de MTS/SDNR al este hacia Genesee Avenue.

La Alternativa 6 de LRT es similar a la Alternativa 1, pero evitaría Voigt Drive al salir de UCSD West Campus y cruzar hacia el lado este de la I-5 al sur de Voigt Drive. En el UCSD East Campus, esta alternativa incluiría una estación el el Hospital Thornton en lugar de una en Voigt Drive.

Cada una de las alternativas de LRT operaría como una extensión de la Línea Azul del Trolley hasta University City. La Línea Azul extendida operaría como una sola línea desde la actual Estación del Centro de Transporte de San Ysidro al sur, hasta University City en el norte, con paradas en todas las estaciones intermedias. La línea de LRT ofrecería un servicio cada 7.5–minutos durante períodos pico y no pico. Al extender la Línea Azul del Trolley a University City, las alternativas de LRT conectarían a los más grandes mercados de traslados en University City con el Downtown San Diego, el sur de San Diego, y Sur de la Bahía sin necesidad de hacer transferencias.
CONSIDERACIONES MEDIOAMBIENTALES

Los tipos de impactos que serán evaluados en el SEIS/SEIR incluye:

- Transporte
- Uso de carriles, zonas y desarrollo económico
- Adquisición de terrenos, desplazamiento y reubicaciones
- Areas de parques y recreación y recursos culturales (incluyendo sitios históricos, arqueológicos y paleontológicos)
- Compatibilidad con vecindarios y justicia medioambiental
- Impactos visuales y estéticos
- Recursos naturales (incluyendo calidad del aire, ruido y vibración, humedales, recursos acuíferos, geología/suelos y materiales peligrosos)
- Uso de energía
- Seguridad
- Fauna silvestre y ecosistemas (incluyendo especies en peligro de extinción)
- Desarrollo de efectos indirectos y acumulativos

La evaluación de impactos será sintetizada en el documento del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR el cual será circulado para comentarios del público y de agencias. Se llevará a cabo una audiencia pública para presentar los resultados documentados en el Borrador del SEIS/SEIR y para escuchar todos los comentarios. El SEIS/SEIR Final será preparado para actualizar y documentar cualquier cambio hecho como resultado de los comentarios recibidos durante la circulación del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR. El SEIS/SEIR Final también identificará las medidas para mitigar los efectos adversos que hayan sido identificados.

CALENDARIO DEL PROYECTO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceso de Sondeo</td>
<td>Preparación del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR</td>
<td>Borrador del SEIS/SEIR</td>
<td>SEIS/SEIR Final</td>
<td>Diseño Final/Construcción</td>
<td>Servicio de Recaudación</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proceso de Sondeo</th>
<th>Preparación del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR</th>
<th>Borrador del SEIS/SEIR</th>
<th>SEIS/SEIR Final</th>
<th>Diseño Final/Construcción</th>
<th>Servicio de Recaudación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Proceso de Sondeo | Preparación del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR | Borrador del SEIS/SEIR | SEIS/SEIR Final | Diseño Final/Construcción | Servicio de Recaudación |
PARTICIPACIÓN PÚBLICA

SANDAG invita a todas las personas y organizaciones, agencias públicas y Tribus Nativas de Estados Unidos interesados en hacer comentarios al sondeo del Borrador del SEIS/SEIR, incluyendo la necesidad y propósito del proyecto, las alternativas que serán estudiadas y los impactos que serán evaluados. Los comentarios deben enfocarse en alternativas que puedan ser menos costosas o tengan menos impactos medioambientales o a la comunidad, al tiempo que se alcanzan objetivos de transporte similares y se identifican importantes asuntos sociales, económicos o medioambientales, relativos a las alternativas.

Calendario de Reuniones del Sondeo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha</th>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Horario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miércoles 5 de mayo 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG - Board Room (7th Floor) 401 B Street, San Diego, CA, 92101</td>
<td>4 a 7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parada de Autobús ubicada en 4th/B St. &amp; Estación del Trolley ubicada en 5ª. Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martes 11 de mayo 2010</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Price Center East Ballroom</td>
<td>3 a 6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parada de Autobús ubicada en Gilman Dr./Myers Dr. en UCSD campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miércoles 12 de mayo 2010</td>
<td>Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center Garfield Theatre</td>
<td>4 a 7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jueves 20 de mayo 2010</td>
<td>Clairemont High School - Cafeteria 4150 Ute Drive, San Diego, CA, 92117</td>
<td>4 a 7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parada de Autobús ubicada en Clairemont Dr./Ute Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martes 25 de mayo 2010</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11 Office Garcia Conference Room</td>
<td>4 a 7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parada de Autobús/Estación de Transporte ubicados en Taylor St./Juan St. &amp; Old Town Transit Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materiales informativos del proyecto estarán disponibles en las reuniones de Sondeo y en el portal de Internet de SANDAG (www.sandag.org/midcoast). También se pueden obtener copias de los materiales comunicándose a midcoast@sandag.org o al (619) 595-5620.

Los comentarios sobre el Borrador del SEIS/SEIR propuesto, pueden entregarse en persona, verbalmente o por escrito, en cualquiera de las cinco Reuniones de Sondeo. Comentarios por escrito también pueden ser enviados por correo regular de EE.UU. o por correo electrónico el o antes del 1° de junio de 2010.

**Por correo a:** Mid-Coast Comments SANDAG 401 B Street, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101

**Correo Electrónico:** midcoast@sandag.org

**Fax a:** (619) 699-1905

En cumplimiento con la ley Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG asistirá a las personas que requieran ayuda para participar en las reuniones de Sondeo enlistadas arriba. Si tal asistencia es requerida, por favor contacte a SANDAG al (619) 595-5620 con al menos 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Para solicitar los materiales en un formato alternativo, por favor llame al (619) 595-5620, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), o fax (619) 699-1905.
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is analyzing alternatives designed to significantly improve mobility in San Diego’s Mid-Coast Corridor. Referred to as the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the selected transit alternative will link downtown San Diego with University City by way of the Old Town Transit Center.

**BACKGROUND**

SANDAG has initiated Scoping for the project’s draft environmental document to allow the public and agencies to learn about conceptual alternatives evaluated to address the corridor’s transit needs and share individual comments on areas of focus to be addressed in the development of the draft environmental document.

**PROJECT STATUS**

Linking Downtown with University City and UCSD

GET INVOLVED IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT
SANDAG has embarked on a comprehensive public involvement effort — detailed in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Public Involvement Plan — to communicate information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and to provide opportunities for input during the environmental review process.

The goal of the Public Involvement Plan is to foster a public involvement process that will support the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The plan is designed to ensure that the public receives timely and useful information about the project, has a broad range of opportunities to provide input on draft plans and environmental documents, and understands how comments have been responded to and utilized in the decision-making process. The Plan has been aligned with federal, state, and local requirements and guidelines for public involvement in transportation projects. Consistent with those guidelines, the plan ensures that social equity, environmental justice, non-discrimination and accessibility goals and policies will be achieved.

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group is a broad-based group of interested citizens who are providing input on the project's purpose and need, alternatives to be considered in the environmental review process, the content of the draft environmental document (SEIS/SEIR) and the Public Involvement Plan. For more information on the Project Working Group including meeting dates, meeting agendas and a membership roster, please visit www.sandag.org/midcoast.

WHERE IS THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR?
The Mid-Coast Corridor starts at downtown San Diego, extending to the existing Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) north to University City. The 14-mile corridor is entirely within the City of San Diego and includes the following communities: University City; La Jolla; Clairemont Mesa; Pacific Beach; Mission Beach; Linda Vista; Old Town; Midway; Middletown; Little Italy and Downtown San Diego.

In addition to diverse and vibrant residential neighborhoods, the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will provide access and connections to major commercial, office, recreational and educational centers including the Golden Triangle; the University of California San Diego (UCSD); the University of San Diego (USD); Mesa College; Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC); La Jolla Village Square Shopping Center; Mission Valley shopping centers; Fashion Valley Mall; Horton Plaza; Veterans Administration Hospital; Scripps Memorial Hospital; Scripps Green Hospital; UCSD Thornton Hospital; the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command; Qualcomm; General Atomics; the Neurosciences Institute; Novartis; Scripps Institution of Oceanography; Sea World; Old Town State Park; Mission Bay Park and Downtown San Diego.

HOW YOU CAN GET INVOLVED
Become informed: Review the latest information on project status as well as meetings, workshops, and other public involvement opportunities.
Attend meetings of the Project Working Group. Agendas and meeting notices are available online.
Subscribe to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project E-mail Newsletter.
Participate in one or more public meetings. The meeting schedule and locations are available online.
Attend SANDAG Transportation Committee and Board of Directors meetings when the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is presented. Meeting notices are posted on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/meetings.
Provide written comments on draft environmental documents when they become available for public review. Visit our Web site for information on how to comment on the draft environmental documents once they are available.
Request a presentation by SANDAG staff for your civic or neighborhood association or group.
For information on getting involved and any of these items, visit www.sandag.org/midcoast, contact us at (619) 595-5620, or e-mail us at midcoast@sandag.org.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
City: __________________ State: _______ Zip: ____________
Phone: ____________________________
E-mail: ____________________________

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
El Proyecto de Transporte Público del Corredor Mid-Coast de SANDAG ha entrado en una importante fase, durante la cual la retroalimentación del público contribuirá al proceso de tomar decisiones. El Período de Sondeo (Scoping) para este proyecto comienza el 3 de mayo de 2010 y continúa hasta el 1 de junio de 2010.

Existen varias maneras para ofrecer sus comentarios a SANDAG durante el Período de Sondeo. Llene la forma abajo y devuélvala al personal en la Reunión de Sondeo, o también puede enviar sus comentarios por correo regular, correo electrónico o fax a SANDAG:

Correo regular: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
Correo electrónico: midcoast@sandag.org
Teléfono: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Portal de Internet: www.sandag.org/midcoast.

Nombre: ____________________________________________

Dirección: __________________________________________

Ciudad: ___________ Estado: ______ C.P.: ____________

Teléfono: __________________________________________

Correo electrónico: __________________________________

☐ Por favor inclúme en su lista de correo electrónico para recibir actualizaciones sobre el Proyecto Mid-Coast.
Request For Information

Name: _______________________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________________

City: _______________ State: _______ Zip: __________

Phone: _______________ E-mail: ____________________________

Description of Information Needed: ____________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
Appendix C
Public Scoping Sign-In Sheets, Comment Cards, and Transcripts
**HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown San Diego Name / Organization</th>
<th>May 5, 2010 Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Conway</td>
<td>1495 2nd Ave</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Spector</td>
<td>8252 Wak Fox Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janay Kung</td>
<td>4660 La Jolla Village Dr # 1080, SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Yost</td>
<td>5080 W. Point Loma Blvd, San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiha Seneviratue</td>
<td>401 Bst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hayes</td>
<td>5450 2nd Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Sinclair</td>
<td>7495 Sperme Pl</td>
<td>Krazy <a href="mailto:Purplet@yahoo.com">Purplet@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Nuss</td>
<td>2200 C St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnusa@tribune.com">jnusa@tribune.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Foygc</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:peterfogec@eterpalmunm.edu">peterfogec@eterpalmunm.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6801 Fiske Ave 92122</td>
<td>dknight3esnrr.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert Essinger</td>
<td>701 Keittner Blvd # 72, CA 92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Came05@yahoo.com">Came05@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego Name / Organization</td>
<td>May 5, 2010 Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Twitchell</td>
<td>PO Box 122381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Van Fleet</td>
<td>8642 C Villa Castilla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Riafrett@san.2.com">Riafrett@san.2.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Helman</td>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bhelman@ucsd.edu">bhelman@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Myers</td>
<td>UC San Diego Faculty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmyers@ucsd.edu">rmyers@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve HAU Devon</td>
<td>9500 Gillman # 05 36</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shau@ucsd.edu">shau@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward K. Lee</td>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Truschke, UCSD</td>
<td>#0980</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtruschke@ucsd.edu">gtruschke@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Lutz</td>
<td>6105 N.              2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jclutz@ucsd.edu">jclutz@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>André Dametz, Urban studies/UCSD</td>
<td>Urban studies/UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adametz@ucsd.edu">adametz@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Tiscareno</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atiscare@ucsd.edu">atiscare@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Guldner</td>
<td>7946 Camino Tetona</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kguldner@ucsd.edu">kguldner@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fai Chan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitsubishi: <a href="mailto:3KG@yahoo.com">3KG@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvan Miller</td>
<td>13050 C Barnfield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yvmiller@yahoo.com">yvmiller@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Morales, UCSD Police</td>
<td>9500 Gilman Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmorris@ucsd.edu">tmorris@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob W. Batt</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twbatt@ucsd.edu">twbatt@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Budamaster</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbudamaster@ucsd.edu">cbudamaster@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Robertson</td>
<td>4554 Sutland Dr, SD9417</td>
<td><a href="mailto:probert6@san.rr.com">probert6@san.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Foreich</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Law</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlawn@ucsd.edu">dlawn@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Meza</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmeza@ucsd.edu">rmeza@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renato Nejia</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rnejia@ucsd.edu">rnejia@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iosuán Patrinco, MA, RV</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ipatrinco@ucsd.edu">ipatrinco@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marciano Pérez</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjperez@ucsd.edu">mjperez@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Kaplan</td>
<td>9500 Gilman Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaplan3c@ucsd.edu">kaplan3c@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lea Rudee</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rudee@ucsd.edu">rudee@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Rudee</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:brudee@san-vr.com">brudee@san-vr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Hemelijn Smii</td>
<td>11 Poole St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sges@ucsd.edu">sges@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stacavage</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jjstacavage@ucsd.edu">jjstacavage@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Chow</td>
<td>9551 Poole St, La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:foresidy@gmail.com">foresidy@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Booth</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dtroth@ucsd.edu">dtroth@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale Dishawoon</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddishawoon@ucsd.edu">ddishawoon@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin DelMastro</td>
<td>4675 Oregon St, SD 92116</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kdelmastro@ucsd.edu">kdelmastro@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glynda Davis</td>
<td>15044 Ruedow Avenue, SD 92159</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glyndadjdavis@hotmail.com">glyndadjdavis@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kdanziszewski@ucsd.edu">kdanziszewski@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Petruska</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:npetruska@ucsd.edu">npetruska@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Aue - UCSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Steindorf</td>
<td>UCSO 0006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Thackston</td>
<td>L150 Community Dana, SD, 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rthackston@ucsd.edu">Rthackston@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Messey</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rmessey@gmail.com">Rmessey@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Liss</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan and <a href="mailto:Liss@gmail.com">Liss@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Blazell</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.blazell@ucsd.edu">andrew.blazell@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jholmes@ucsd.edu">jholmes@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hurley</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Churley@ucsd.edu">Churley@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churn.ewskeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nguyen</td>
<td></td>
<td>JLN <a href="mailto:88@UCSD.Edu">88@UCSD.Edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese Baggi</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thaggi@ucsd.edu">Thaggi@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana Walker/ACTB</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AHWalker@ucsd.edu">AHWalker@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Lyon/USP Dept</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Samlyon@ucsd.edu">Samlyon@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wafa Ben Hassane/AS Pres</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wbenhass@ucsd.edu">Wbenhass@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Flack</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cflack@ucsd.edu">Cflack@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Russakoff</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RRUSSAKOFF@YAHOO.COM">RRUSSAKOFF@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Cilley</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tcilley@ucsd.edu">Tcilley@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley P. Nutphayk</td>
<td>UCSD Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:APRESMYK@UCSD.EDU">APRESMYK@UCSD.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU Delouru</td>
<td>UCSD Community Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ADELOURU@UCSD.EDU">ADELOURU@UCSD.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Backeleg</td>
<td>UCSD Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ABARKELEG@UCSD.EDU">ABARKELEG@UCSD.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hertz</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HERZ@UCSD.EDU">HERZ@UCSD.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thorpe</td>
<td>Dept. of Sociology, UCSD 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cthorpe@ucsd.edu">cthorpe@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Simmons-Smith</td>
<td>8B38-5 Villa La Jolla Dr, La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:softhgee@aol.com">softhgee@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Daly UCSD</td>
<td>Facilities Design &amp; Const.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdaley@ucsd.edu">jdaley@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A. Anderson</td>
<td>6949 Fisk Ave S.P., San Diego, CA 92122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Westling</td>
<td>4170 Pacific Palms #18, San Diego, CA 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwestling@ucsd.edu">cwestling@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ngai</td>
<td>4165 Executive Dr. #1041, San Diego, CA 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sangai@ucsd.edu">sangai@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica Aguilas</td>
<td>One Mission St #929374, La Jolla, CA 92092</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caaquilar@ucsd.edu">caaquilar@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Tsiatas UCSD</td>
<td>3609 Palmilla Dr, Apt #201, San Diego, CA 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atsiatas@ucsd.edu">atsiatas@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imanityus</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ityus@ucsd.edu">ityus@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamedina@ucsd.edu">jamedina@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng-Jun Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mvwu@ucsd.edu">mvwu@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UCSD May 11, 2010

### Name / Organization
- Richard Thompson (Richard@alumni.ucsd.edu)
- Elizabeth Elman (Elman@ucsd.edu)
- Rob Klima (Robklima@gmail.com)
- Rex Graham (Ragraham@ucsd.edu)
- Sarah Gilles (Sgille@ucsd.edu)
- Stephanie Alaimo (Sajax@ucsd.edu)
- Fred Laan
- Carol Lee (P.O. Box 927555, 92193)
- Isabelle Kany
- Florentino Guran
- Walter Wong

### Address
- 3680 Moultrie, S.D. 92117
- 3163A Every Way
- 3163A 11 11
- San Diego, CA
## Help Improve Mobility in the Mid-Coast Corridor

**UCSD**  
**May 11, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lotan</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td><a href="mailto:benjolotan@gmail.com">benjolotan@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Buenaventura</td>
<td>7687 Palmilla Dr. Apt. 201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nbuenave@ucsd.edu">nbuenave@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Arce / ASUCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:AAAACO@ucsd.edu">AAAACO@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Schwenke / UCSD undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>c <a href="mailto:schwenk@ucsd.edu">schwenk@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Bennett / Birchbox</td>
<td></td>
<td>A <a href="mailto:Bennett@Birchbox.com">Bennett@Birchbox.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Schwarm</td>
<td>UCSD FDS C</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kschwam@ucsd.edu">Kschwam@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Favela</td>
<td>7868 Camino Tramonti</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BFavela@ucsd.edu">BFavela@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Stringer</td>
<td>7014 Via Coello 92009</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Waltstringer@swbglobal.net">Waltstringer@swbglobal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Pradag</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpradag@ucsd.edu">mpradag@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary B Hoffman</td>
<td>3982 Lee Jollie Village Dr 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghoffman@ucsd.edu">ghoffman@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Leung</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hhleung@ucsd.edu">hhleung@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Higgins (UCSD)</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steven@ucsd.edu">Steven@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Keith-McMullin</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lcmcullin@ucsd.edu">lcmcullin@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dejuanne Lei</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlei@ucsd.edu">dlei@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hogue</td>
<td>3590 Stetson Ave. 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lhogue1@san.rr.com">Lhogue1@san.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjs201@ucsd.edu">sjs201@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Matthews</td>
<td>UC-San Diego</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmatthews@ucsd.edu">gmatthews@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Weinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jweinstein@ucsd.edu">jweinstein@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Burh</td>
<td>Coastal Commission (SD office)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gburch@coastal.ca.gov">gburch@coastal.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gottlieb</td>
<td>3940 Giestam St #134, 92109</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jimmy@TokyoJim.com">jimmy@TokyoJim.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Fedder</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mfedder@ucsd.edu">mfedder@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Strom</td>
<td>8268 Gilman Dr #16 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dstrom@ucsd.edu">dstrom@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Help Improve Mobility in
**The Mid-Coast Corridor**

**UCSD**

**May 11, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Conant</td>
<td>4052 Abatross Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dconant@gmail.com">dconant@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Galang</td>
<td>3256 Cam. 74th Bluff #116</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daphnegalang@yahoo.com">daphnegalang@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Klein</td>
<td>5983 Cam. Silvella SD 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cerosado@san.rr.com">cerosado@san.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Rosado</td>
<td>4056 Caminito Melaque 92122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Wrobleski</td>
<td>3249-32 CTO. EAST BLUFF-LA JOJA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Juarez</td>
<td>1701 K Ave. NADHROL CITY, CA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lparcy@waterboards.com">lparcy@waterboards.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Parker</td>
<td>9775 S. FERNANDEZ AVE 92121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Couper</td>
<td>7270 MALABRIA CT. UNID 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sterkmaureen@hotmail.com">sterkmaureen@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen &amp; Bill Steék</td>
<td>7902 Playmore Ter 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rafish+wang@yahoo.com">rafish+wang@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Wang</td>
<td>8666 Villa La Jolla Dr. #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Teutsch</td>
<td>16432 Education Ave SD 92122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Burnett</td>
<td>3256 Cam. 74th Bluff #116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Throckmorton</td>
<td>4925 Regal Ct. SD 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:halthrockmorton@century21award.com">halthrockmorton@century21award.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Berman</td>
<td>9821 Genesee Ave 92121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Lanesoof</td>
<td>P.O. Box 434 La Jolla 92038</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j84rob@yahoo.com">j84rob@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard Wells</td>
<td>3385 Tulane St 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:will.judith@prodigy.net">will.judith@prodigy.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Williams</td>
<td>San Diego CA 92122 #145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Wilson/UCRG</td>
<td>4185 Ponte de Valmas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patwilson2002@aol.com">patwilson2002@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Fleming</td>
<td>8446 Via Sorona #94 La Jolla 92037</td>
<td>pfleming-pa@spc6忐忑.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Mays</td>
<td>202 &quot;C&quot; Street, SD 92101</td>
<td>jmays@san diego.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolay Halov</td>
<td>8425 Villa La Jolla Dr.</td>
<td>wacky pawa <a href="mailto:n@yahoo.com">n@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MID-COAST CORRIDOR

## TRANSIT PROJECT

**May 12, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name / Organization</strong></th>
<th><strong>Address</strong></th>
<th><strong>Email</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erik Ruelh / VRPA Technologies</td>
<td>9520 Padgett St #213</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eruehr@vrpatltechnologies.com">eruehr@vrpatltechnologies.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Harris / Irvine Company</td>
<td>9350 La Salle Village Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wharris@irvencompany.com">wharris@irvencompany.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janay Krueger</td>
<td>4013 Porte de Palmas #53</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Janay_KRUEGER@MSN.COM">Janay_KRUEGER@MSN.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>16680 Buckwheat Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pherron1@san.rr.com">pherron1@san.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Taylor</td>
<td>8636-B Via Hallowca</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ntaylor@casas.org">ntaylor@casas.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Deier</td>
<td>3256 K, 2 Marina 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aclan.delier@sbglobal.net">aclan.delier@sbglobal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hagler</td>
<td>4126 Executive Dr 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susanH@LFJCC.com">susanH@LFJCC.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK SPECTER</td>
<td>6652 Willow La Jolla Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Jones</td>
<td>11022 Carrie Ridge # 6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BSfue@quicken.com.mm.com">BSfue@quicken.com.mm.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Jones</td>
<td>11082 Ashley Rd # 2226</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rcubeddi@hotmail.com">rcubeddi@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Slater</td>
<td>4140 Camino Lita, S.D., CA 92125</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RichardSL87@comcast.net">RichardSL87@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Marcus Carden</td>
<td>9490 Genoa Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmarcus@lycos.com">mmarcus@lycos.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilmini Silva-Feild</td>
<td>14192 Reynolds Dr, Del Mar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:silvasend@aol.com">silvasend@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Maurerer</td>
<td>4120 CHARLEST ST, SANDIEGO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.maurer@earthlink.net">david.maurer@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith J. Wells</td>
<td>3335 Tulane St, SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dakez</td>
<td>2731 HAVASUPAI AVN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kc.dakez@gmail.com">kc.dakez@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Stultz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Dupree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Lichtenmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna Halova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihir Patel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Western Clairemont Meeting
May 20, 2010

#### Name / Organization
- Carmen Jacobo
- Ted Jacobo
- Matt Schwabauer
- Al Pearson
- Gene Dobey
- Jerry & Sushila Selvig
- Pam & Phil Lavin
- Nan Valenz
- John & Gail Coxe
- Elizabeth Hill
- Jon Christiansen

#### Address
- 4331 Hacienda Ave, 72117
- 9655 Genesee Ave, 92121
- 610 W. Redwood, 92103
- 3257 Steger
- 5764 Ariane Dr
- 4611 Montgomery Sr
- 3410 Vim Behren
- 4932 Mt Antero
- 3596 Paul Jones Ave
- 6246 Agua St #121 92122
- 6387 Cowley Wy, SD 92110

#### Email
- braesycronny@yahoo.com
- raiders20t@yahoo.com
- schwabauer@gmail.com
- ginedobey@sbcglobal.net
- sppc@pacbell.net
- home@coxe.net
- bhill6216@sbcglobal.net
- 2387 Cowley Wy, SD 92110
# Help Improve Mobility in the Mid-Coast Corridor

**Western Clairemont Meeting**
May 20, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamara L Crowell</td>
<td>2353 Deeppark Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tammy@mx.net">Tammy@mx.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Ames</td>
<td>1414 Fiell st</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sames@uc.edu">sames@uc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Ames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane White</td>
<td>2921 Avenida Niguel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Blackford</td>
<td>3355 Via del Conquistador</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KBBLACK@PACBELL.NET">KBBLACK@PACBELL.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>1513 Congress st</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.daniszewski@yahoo.com">ken.daniszewski@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael AED/20</td>
<td>570 42 x 5D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Ruffolo</td>
<td>4501 Rolfe Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5300 Alamo Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kell</td>
<td>1301 La Palmita St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Becker</td>
<td>3551 Avenida Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Miller</td>
<td>3711 Balboa Terrace #C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>3840 Brandywine Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:personelle@att.com">personelle@att.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Karrer</td>
<td>9611 Lisa Ann St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Heffell</td>
<td>8525 Mt. Lawrence Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janishread68@globalnet.com">janishread68@globalnet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Schmidt</td>
<td>2122 Totalon St</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margiesandiego@gmail.com">margiesandiego@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hauen</td>
<td>8356 Via Sorvina, E</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DHAUEN24@ATT.COM">DHAUEN24@ATT.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Lanctot Kihl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gliaia Terndasky</td>
<td>2702 Cowley Way San Diego 92104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Van Delden</td>
<td>2560 Adams St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Beal</td>
<td>8340 Via Sorvina # B92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christinab2010@live.com">christinab2010@live.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Parks</td>
<td>1810 Denver St. 92110 853-5337</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terence.parks@netscape.net">terence.parks@netscape.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark-Parks</td>
<td>72-175 W 216 St. 92101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.clark@flash.net">c.clark@flash.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Martin</td>
<td>7212 La Jolla Shores</td>
<td>reo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Holmes</td>
<td>3201 Echevarria St. 92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hedges</td>
<td>7821 La Jolla 92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyn Ballard</td>
<td>4208 Camino Tico 92122 5 92122</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kballard1@san.vice.com">kballard1@san.vice.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Langsone</td>
<td>PO Box 1034 1522 92038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lucas</td>
<td>8162 Posada 92109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jackowski</td>
<td>MTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markey Manuel</td>
<td>5558 Imperial St. 5 So. 92116</td>
<td><a href="mailto:markey.manuel@recoverycheckers.org">markey.manuel@recoverycheckers.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Denisewski</td>
<td>2540 Congress</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.denisewski@yahoo.com">k.denisewski@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Plachinski</td>
<td>2586 Oakmont Drive 92110</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.denisewski@yahoo.com">k.denisewski@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross A. Clark</td>
<td>3532 Couley Way, San Diego, CA 92117</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maeclarke@san.rr.com">maeclarke@san.rr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Jimenez</td>
<td>LSD ASSOCIATES, INC.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joseph.jimenez@csa-4352x.com">Joseph.jimenez@csa-4352x.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J. Britt</td>
<td>2821 Marine Blvd, SD 92117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Welgans</td>
<td>1719 Kearns Ave Rd, La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aWelgans@sierradubsandiego.org">aWelgans@sierradubsandiego.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Allen</td>
<td>8386 Mira Marinal Rd 15, San Diego, CA 92121</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danallen@alum.mit.edu">danallen@alum.mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xeta Networks</td>
<td>749 Selma Pl</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@xetanetworks.com">info@xetanetworks.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Steiner</td>
<td>231 Garrett Ave, Chula Vista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Gutierrez</td>
<td>4570 Patricia Dr, S.D. 92115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgrady@cox.net">mgrady@cox.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Ingrassi</td>
<td>Robert120073, SD 92115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Hard</td>
<td>Robert120073, SD 92115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blair@welltrends.com">blair@welltrends.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J. Fierman</td>
<td>17,450 L Street,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valencia, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92101-7672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: Ken Sinclair  
Address: 749 Selma Pl  
City: San Diego  
State: CA  
Zip: 92114  
Phone:  
E-mail: krazypurple2@cox.net

Comments:

Need to Think About a Ped bridge Across I5 to Mission bay and other Places in That Area.

More Public Art Along the trolley stations.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Ken Sinclair
Address: 749 Selma Pl
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92114
Phone:
E-mail: Krazy Purple2@cox.net

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Need to think about a pedestrian bridge across I-5 to Mission Bay and other places in that area.

More public art along the trolley stations.
Comments:

As a UCSD student with no car, it can be very difficult for me to get around San Diego. I have friends in Ocean Beach, North Park, and my family is in South San Diego, & I have to commute at least 1.5 hrs just to get to Ocean Beach on a weekday. A trolley from the UCSD area would be fantastic for future students or those looking to get to UCSD to visit (such as my friends further South). In general, extended hours would also be fantastic, for all transit, as there have been times when I couldn’t go out because I knew I wouldn’t be able to get home, as the services would stop running. Extended hours at least on weekends would be an amazing addition to the Mid-West Corridor project.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-6620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Angélica Aguilar

Address: 41165 Executive Dr #104, SD, CA 92037

City: State: Zip: 

Phone: (619) 587-1184

E-mail: ipatakcha@gmail.com

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
As a UCSD student with no car, it can be very difficult for me to get around San Diego. I have friends in Ocean Beach, North Park, and my family is in South San Diego, & I have to commute at least 1.5 hrs just to get to Ocean Beach on a weekday. A trolley from the UCSD area would be fantastic for future students or those looking to get to UCSD to visit (such as my friends further south). In general, extended hours would also be fantastic for all transit, as there have been times when I couldn't go out because I knew I wouldn't be able to get home, as the services would stop running. Extended hours at least on weekends would be amazing in addition to the Mid-West Corridor project.
Name: Brian Chow  
Address: 9585 Genesee Ave J-1  
City: San Diego  
State: CA  
Zip: 92121  
Phone: (626) 429-2086  
E-mail: forespidy@gmail.com

Comments:

Don’t go through Rose Canyon  
Use the I-5 instead.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Brian Chow

Address: 9585 Genesee Ave J-1

City: SAN DIEGO State: CA zip: 92121

Phone: 626-429-2086

E-mail: forespidy @ gmail.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Don't go through Rose Canyon
Use the I-5 instead.
Name: David Conart
Address: 4052 Albatross
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92103
Phone:
E-mail:

Comments:
I think the light rail is an exciting move but I am concerned about the location of the possible stop route through Rose Canyon. The environmental effect of our projects needs to be a greater consideration.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: David Gonzales
Address: 405 S. Albatross
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92113
Phone:
E-mail:

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I think the light rail is an exciting move, but I am concerned about the location of the possible deep route through Lost Canyon. The environmental effect of our projects needs to be a greater consideration.
Name: Ken Daniszewski
Address: 2543 Congress St., Apt 102
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92110
Phone: (619) 405-4286
E-mail: kendaniszewski@yahoo.com

Comments:
1. Please find a way to connect to the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station.
2. Please Find a way to go thruru [sic] provide more service to the Nobel Dr. area

(note: See image on document)

Coaster access very important [sic]
Plan 1
I don’t think Plan 1 is optimal
I really do not like plan 1
* too noisy [sic] on campus
* misses UCSD residential area on Nobel Dr.
* No coaster connection
Plan 1 not satisfactoy [sic]
I think an “S” shape reaching the coaster much better
If you reach the coaster, people in the sorrento valley can access the campus much easier
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Ken Daniszewski

Address: 2543 Congress St., Apt 102
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92110

Phone: 619-405-4286

E-mail: kandaniszewski@yahoo.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
1. Please find a way to connect to the Sorento Valley Coaster Station.
2. Please find a way to go there provide more service to the Nobel Dr. area.

Coaster very important

Plan 1

I don't think Plan 1 is optimal

I really do not like Plan 1

If you reach the coaster, people in the Sorento valley can access the campus much easier.

* No coaster commute
* Missed UCSD residential area on Nobel Dr.
* Too noisy on campus
Comments:
I am extremely excited that the light rail will hopefully be coming to UCSD and connecting us with the rest of San Diego! However, I am concerned about the route that would go through Rose Canyon. This route would unnecessarily threaten one of the few natural habitats left in San Diego for no real ridership increase or cost decrease. Thank you for your dedication to sustainable transportation!
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Elizabeth Elman

Address: 4052 Albion St

City: SD State: CA Zip: 92103

Phone:

E-mail: elizabeth_elman@gmail.com

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I am extremely excited that the light rail will hopefully be coming to UCSD and connecting us with the rest of San Diego. However, I am concerned about the route that would go through Rose Canyon. This route would unnecessarily threaten one of the few natural habitats left in San Diego for no real ridership increase or cost decrease.

Thank you for your dedication to sustainable transportation.
I like the idea of the trolley coming to the UCSD campus. To make it rideable \textit{sic} for me I would want the trolley to go to campus before going to UTC if Ni bound & of course, south bound away from campus would not require a visit to UTC.

I prefer alignments 1 & 6

I would also like to see better accommodations for cyclist. It would be ideal for me to take the trolley to work w/ my bike and then ride home.

Having 2 stops @ UCSD would help those times when I need to get to Thorton hospital.

I would NOT use this line at the trolley if alignment #3 is chosen.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Steven Higgins
Address: 5421 Via Aquaria
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92111
Phone:

E-mail: geoseeker@ucsd.edu

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I like the idea of the trolley coming to the UCSD campus. To make it viable for me, I would want the trolley to go to campus before going to UTC if N. Bound St. is not required a visit to UTC.

I prefer alignments 2 + 6.

I would also like to see better accommodations for cyclists. It would be ideal for me to take the trolley to work with my bike and then ride home.

Having 2 stops @ UCSD would help those times when I need to get to Thornton Hospital.

I would not use this line if the trolley is alignment #3 is chosen.
Comments:

I’m very excited to have the trolley come to University City! It will be great to walk or bike to UTC or Nobel Drive and take the trolley downtown. However, the trolley shouldn’t go through Rose Canyon Park to Genesee Ave. This will further degrade this precious open space area. Therefore, I support LRT1. This alternative also serves the UCSD population better, with a stop at Nobel. It also comes closer to the employment centers near SAIC.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Larry Hogue
Address: 3590 Stetson Ave.
City: San Diego    State: CA    Zip: 92122
Phone: 858-452-6654
E-mail: lhoque1@san.rr.com

[ ] Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I’m very excited to have the trolley come to University City. It will be great to walk or bike to UTC or Nobel Drive and take the trolley downtown.

However, the trolley shouldn’t go through Rose Canyon Park to Genesee Ave. This will further degrade this precious open space area. Therefore, I support LRT. This alternative also serves the UCSD population better, with a stop at Nobel. It also comes closer to the employment centers near SARC.
Name: David Krysl
Address: 4013 Camino Lindo
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92122
Phone: (858) 205-0390
E-mail: mangledcougar@gmail.com

Comments:

[no comments provided]
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN 
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: David Krysl

Address: 4913 Camino Lindo

City: San Diego    State: CA    Zip: 92122

Phone: 760 205 0390

E-mail: mangled.coygar@gmail.com

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Name: Helen Leung
Address: 6657 Richard St.
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92115
Phone:
E-mail: hhleung@ucsd.edu

Comments:
I have no problems with this project. But I suggest that you be mindful of the low income neighborhoods that this might negatively affect. At the same time, you should think about how you can make UCSD more accessible [sic] to communities of color in San Diego.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 599-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Helen Leung
Address: 6687 Richard St.
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92115
Phone:
E-mail: hleung@ucsd.edu

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I have no problems with this project. But I suggest that you be mindful of the low-income neighborhoods that this might negatively affect. At the same time, you should think about how you can make UCSD more accessible to communities of color in San Diego.
Comments:

I am concerned about how the trolley will affect my neighborhood. I heard there might be a trolley stop added to the base of my street (Jutland Drive) at Morena Blvd. Will it affect my neighborhood adversely? We already have a homeless encampment near the RR tracks at Jutland & Morena. Won’t this bring more homeless into the neighborhood? What will this do to foot traffic in my neighborhood? I look forward to hearing back from someone on my concerns.

Patricia Robertson

probert6@san.rr.com  (858) 274-5528 (H)
^ number 6  (858) 822-2541 (W)
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Patricia Robertson

Address: 4559 Jutland Drive

City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92117

Phone: (858) 274-5538 W: (858) 832-2541

E-mail: probertb@san.rr.com

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I am concerned about how the trolley will affect my neighborhood. I heard there might be a trolley stop added to the base of my street (Jutland Drive) at Morena Blvd. Will it affect my neighborhood adversely? We already have a homeless encampment near the RR tracks at Jutland & Morena. Won't this bring more homeless into the neighborhood?

What will this do to foot traffic in my neighborhood?

I look forward to hearing back from someone on my concerns.

Patricia Robertson
probert@san.rr.com (858) 274-5538 (H)
6 number 6 (858) 833-2541 (W)
Name: Carol Schwenke
Address: 4628 Del Monte Ave
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92107
Phone:
E-mail: cschwenk@ucsd.edu

Comments:
I believe that the orange route, which travels through undisturbed habitat, should be avoided. I believe that the Red route is my first & best choice.
Service to the Preuss School is of utmost importance as this location serves many students that currently ride buses that have to travel from the North to South & back, twice a day, consuming a lot of fuel & generating emissions. Service along Nobel Dr. would benefit many UCSD students. The current 150 bus route serves my needs except for the fact that service ends at 7pm. This LRT would serve members of the community better by providing access to UTC mall.

The I5 corridor should be utilized but not widened towards the West, which could jeopardize the stability of Mt. Soledad. Thank You.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Carol Schwende
Address: 4628 Del Monte Ave
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92107
Phone: 
E-mail: cschwend@ixsd.edu

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I believe that the Orange route, which travels through undisturbed habitat, should be avoided. I believe that the Red route is my first—best choice. Service to the Preuss School is of utmost importance as this location serves many students that currently ride buses that have to travel from the North to South & back, twice a day, consuming a lot of fuel & generating emissions. Service along Nobel Dr. would benefit many UCSD students. The current 150 bus route serves my needs except for the fact that service ends at 7 pm. This LRT would serve members of the community better by providing access to UTC Mall. The 15F corridor should be utilized but not widened toward the West, which could jeopardize the stability of Mt. Soledad. Thank you.
Name: Dave Strom  
Address: 8268 Gilman Dr #16  
City: La Jolla  
State: CA  
Zip: 92037  
Phone: (858) 452-0338  
E-mail: dstrom@ucsd.edu

Comments:  

[no comments provided]
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 599-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: DANIEL STROM
Address: 8268 GILMAN DR #16
City: LA JOLLA State: CA Zip: 92037
Phone: 858-457-0338
E-mail: dstrom@ucsd.edu

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT
SANDAG
Keep the cost per ride affordable [sic] and give monthly/quarterly pass to students.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Vikram Subramanya
Address: UCSB
City: State: Zip: 92092
Phone:
E-mail: vikram.53@gmail.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Keep the cost per ride affordable and give monthly/quarterly passes to students.
Name: Brian Jones
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Phone:
E-mail: bjones@qualcomm.com

Comments:

I fully support the idea of extending the trolley from old town, for the overall common good of the communities [sic] that the new line will service. All the routes have been carefully considered with regard to cost and minimal impacts to the environment, and I believe that either of the proposed trolley routes are equally good.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: BRIAN JONES

Address:

City: __________ State: _______ Zip: __________

Phone: __________

E-mail: bsjones@qualcomm.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I fully support the idea of extending the trolley from old town, for the overall common good of the community that the new line will serve.

The All the routes have been carefully considered with regard to cost and minimal impacts to the environment, and I believe that either of the proposed trolley routes are equally good.
Name: D Jones
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Phone:
E-mail:

Comments:

Thank Goodness – Trolley coming north of 8
My comments are as follows:

- Don’t like yellow (# 3) alternative because it goes thru [sic] Rose Canyon and requires tunneling
- I like the red line(s) because it appears to service more residents and businesses in the area → However, it could have another stop added or ensure connectivity with superloop.
- There could be an added stop at Costco too, as there are several bmovers [sic] in that corridor Charlotte Russ [sic], Karl Strauss etc. that have no other transit options
- Too bad no connection to the Coaster via rail. Project should ensure finding for a connector shuttle so UTC monies [sic] employees can connect to Coaster for point north.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: 

Address: 

City: State: Zip: 

Phone: 

E-mail: 

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Thank Goodness - Trolley coming north.

My comments are as follows:

- Don't like yellow (4# 3) alternative because it goes thru Rose Canyon and requires tunneling.
- I like the red lines) because it appears to serve more residents and businesses in the area.
- However, it could have another stop added or enhance connectivity with Superloop.
- There could be an added stop at Cost Co too, as there are several businesses in that corridor: Charlotte Russe, Lead Strauss etc. that have no other transit option.
- Too bad no connection to the Coaster via rail. Project should ensure funding for a connector shuttle so UTC business employees can connect to Coaster for points north.
Name: Rachel Lichterman  
Address: PO Box 12012  
City: La Jolla  
State: CA  
Zip: 92039  
Phone: (262) 853-0219  
E-mail: ralichterman@gmail.com

Comments:

Prefer LRT1; cost effective and connects the student/professional population to downtown. Consider expanding trolley route farther north to help decrease traffic.

Routes through UCSD campus East are less effective in cutting Rush hour traffic because students generally live close to campus or can utilize UCSD shuttles. – which UCSD west station should then suffice.

Strongly vote for LRT1 with stops in front of Scripps Memorial La Jolla Hospital. & UTC.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Rachel Lichterman
Address: PO Box 12012
City: La Jolla State: CA Zip: 92039
Phone: 202-853-0219
E-mail: rauchterman@gmail.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Comments

Prefer LRT 1; cost effective and connects the student/professional population to downtown. Consider expanding trolley route farther north to help decrease traffic.

Routes through UCSD campus east are less effective in cutting rush hour traffic because students generally live close to campus or can utilize UCSD shuttles. - which UCSD West station should then suffice.

Strongly vote for LRT 1 with stops in front of Scripps Memorial La Jolla Hospital.
Name: Nancy Taylor  
Address: 8636-B Via Mallorca  
City: La Jolla  
State: CA  
Zip: 92037  
Phone: (858) 922-1399  
E-mail: ntaylor@casas.org

Comments:

(I’m on the list already)

The trolley extension is a much-needed project in a very heavily populated area. Thank you for extending another public transportation alternative to this community.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Nancy Taylor
Address: 8636-B Via Mallorca
City: La Jolla State: CA Zip: 92037
Phone: 858-922-1399
E-mail: ntaylor@casas.org

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
   (I'm on the list already.)
The trolley extension is a much-needed project in a heavily populated area. Thank you for extending another public transportation alternative to this community.
SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Public Scoping Meeting Comment Cards

Meeting: Clairemont on May 20, 2010

Name: Marilyn Ames
Address: 4414 Field St.
City: SD
State: CA
Zip: 92117
Phone:
E-mail:

Comments:

It is my opinion that in order for S.D. to truly have a mass transit system the city bus system must be expanded to support the trolley system. Too many S.D. neighborhoods do not have convenient access to the bus lines. This would need to change. Also bus stops would need to have convenient parking spaces to accommodate the cars of people taking the bus to the trolley station. Trolley stations also need to have adequate park and ride lots.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Marilyn Jones
Address: 4414 Field St
City: SD State: CA Zip: 92117
Phone:
E-mail:

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
It is my opinion that in order for SD to truly have a Mass transit system, the city bus system must be expanded to support the trolley system. Too many SD neighborhoods do not have convenient access to the bus lines. This would need to change. Also bus stops would need to have convenient parking spaces to accommodate the cars of people taking the bus to a trolley station. Trolley stations also need to have adequate park and ride lots.
Name: John Coxe
Address: 3596 Paul Jones Avenue
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92117
Phone: 858.273.3059
E-mail: home@coxe.net

Comments:

Mainly concerned with potential noise and crime impacts in the Balboa/Morena area.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: John Coxe
Address: 3596 Paul Jones Avenue
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92117
Phone: 858 273 3059
E-mail: home@coxer.net

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Mainly concerned with potential noise & crime impacts in the Balboa/Morona area.
SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Public Scoping Meeting Comment Cards

Meeting: Clairemont on May 20, 2010

Name: Gine Dobey
Address: 2764-88 Ariane Dr.
City: SD
State: CA
Zip: 92117
Phone:
E-mail: ginedobey@sbcglobal.net

Comments:

I have great concern about the potential for added noise and impact on the Rose Canyon area if Alternative 3 is selected. Please consider carefully.
Gine Dobey
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Gine Dobey
Address: 2764-88 Ariane Dr.
City: SD State: Zip: 92117
Phone: 
E-mail: ginedobey@sbcglobal.net

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Comments: I have great concern about the potential for added noise and impact on the Rose Canyon area if Alternative 3 is selected. Please consider carefully.

[Signature]
Name: Elizabeth Hill
Address: 6216 Agee Street #121
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92122
Phone: 858.455.0936
E-mail: bhill6216@sbcglobal.net

Comments:

Alternative 1 is absolutely the best choice for the trolley route.

Additional general comment regarding traffic congestion in University City: the need for completion of the Regents Rd. bridge is sorely needed. Genesee Ave. is not able to provide adequate escape during a fire or earthquake. It is blocked for emergency vehicles when morning and after-noon employees fill both lanes on Genesee going north and south creating a parking lot atmosphere. Fire engines, ambulances, police cars cannot respond to calls. The highschool traffic adds to the congestion. Pedestrians are risking their lives when walking across the Genesee/Governor Dr. intersection.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 830, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Elizabeth Hill
Address: 6216 Agee St. #12
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92122
Phone: 858-455-0936
E-mail: bhill6216@sbcglobal.net

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Alternative 1 is absolutely the best choice for the trolley route.

Additional general comment regarding traffic congestion in University City; the need for completion of the Regents Rd. bridge is sorely needed. Genesee Ave. is not able to provide adequate escape during a fire or earthquake. It is blocked for emergency vehicles when morning and afternoon employees fill both lanes on Genesee going north and south creating a parking lot atmosphere. Fire engines, ambulances, police cars cannot respond to calls. The high school traffic adds to the congestion. Pedestrians are risking their lives when walking across the Genesee/Governor Dr. intersection.
Comments:

Will bus schedules be co-ordinated with trolley schedules? Can you accommodate parking for the commuters? How? Especially the Balboa station.

What are the incentives for people to leave their cars and take the trolley? Reduced monthly rates? Eco friendly? Easy transfers from bus to trolley? Other?
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Sam Ahmed

Address: 4114 Field St

City: San Diego State: Zip: 92117

Phone:

E-mail:

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Will our schedule be co-ordinated with trolley schedules?
Can you accommodate parking for the commuters? How? E.g., Balboa station.

What are the incentives for people to leave their cars and take the trolley?
Reduced monthly rates?
Eco-friendly?
Easy transfers from bus to trolley?
Other?
Comments:

The Executive Dr. station seems redundant (sic) (so close to both UTC & UCSD East). The money spent on this station seems like it would be better spent on increasing the walkableness (sic) of the area from both of the other stations. Pedestrian friendly concepts need to be incorporated in development of each of the stations since most are not located in high density residential areas.

Has there been communication with Sea World about them providing a shuttle circuit to & from the Tecolote Station. This would make so much sense and increase the usefulness of the station since at present their (sic) are limited local potential users.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Margaret Schmidt
Address: 2222 Tokalon St.
City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92110
Phone:
E-mail: margiesandiego@aol.com

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
The Executive Dr station seems redundant (so close to both UTC & USCD East). The money spent on this station seems like it would be better spent on increasing the walkability of the area from both of the other stations. Pedestrian friendly concepts need to be incorporated in development of each of the stations since most are not located in high density residential areas.

Has there been communication with SeaWorld about about them providing a shuttle circuit to & from the Te cdecl station. This would make so much sense and increase the usefulness of the station since at present their are limited local potential users.


Name: Dan Allen  
Address: 1714 Kearsarge Rd.  
City: La Jolla  
State: CA  
Zip: 92037  
Phone: 858.459.1540  
E-mail: danallen@alum.mit.edu

Comments:

Three comments:

1) The project scope should include greater definition of and discussion of connecting service to and from stations into the total “Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Study Area” such as La Jolla (community planning area), Sorrento Mesa, Miramar (employment area) and Torrey Pines Mesa. Designation of just the NCTD #101 for the last listed area will not provide needed commuter connection. Adding connector service to the project scope is important to physical design of stations and modifications to streets around stations for access.

2) The routing should go beyond UTC to connect with the Coaster. The Nobel Coaster stop will eventually happen.

3) One of the stops at the northern end of the route needs to have a large parking lot or structure that is reasonably conveniently accessible from and to I-5. People in the future will expect to be able to drive south from Del Mar, Encinitas, etc. and then use the LRT. (This as one does today driving to Old Town and making the transfer of modes.)
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mailing Address: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Dan Allen
Address: 1714 Kearsarge Rd
City: La Jolla State: CA Zip: 92037
Phone: 858 459 1540
E-mail: danallen@alum.mit.edu

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Three comments:

1) The project scope should include greater definition of and discussion of connecting service to and from stations into the total "Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Study Area" such as La Jolla (community planning area), Sorrento Mesa, Miramar (employment area) and Torrey Pines Mesa. Designation of just the NCTD #101 for the last listed area will not provide needed commuter connection. Adding connector service to the project scope is important to physical design of stations and modifications to streets around stations for access.

2) The routing should go beyond UTC to connect with the Coaster. The Nobel Coaster stop will eventually happen.

3) One of the stops at the northern end of the route needs to have a large parking lot or structure that is reasonably conveniently accessible from and to I-5. People in the future will expect to be able to drive south from Del Mar, Encinitus, etc. and then use the LRT. This as one does today driving to Old Town and making the transfer of modes.
Name: Karilyn Ballard
Address: 4208 Camino Ticino
City: SD
State: CA
Zip: 92122
Phone: 858.412.4756
E-mail: kballard1@san.rr.com

Comments:

Yea! I am so excited to hear that the Trolley line is being extended to the UCSD/UTC area.
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: mtdcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Karilyn Ballard

Address: 4208 Camino Tico

City: San Diego State: CA zip: 92122

Phone: 858 412 4756

E-mail: kbballard1@senrr.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
Comments: Yea! I am so excited to hear that the Trolley line is being extended to the UCSD/UTC area.
I support the Mid-Coast extension of the trolley and favor LRT Alternative #1 (red).
Thanks!
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: MARK BOWERS

Address: 1601 KETTNER BLVD #29

City: SAN DIEGO State: CA zip: 92101

Phone:

E-mail: MARKBOWERS@COX.NET

Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I support the MID-COST extension of the Trolley and favor LRT Alternative #1 (Red). Thanks.
Name: Christine A. Clark
Address: 1810 Denver St.
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip: 92110
Phone: 619.275.2161
E-mail: caclark@flash.net

Comments:
I support the mid-cost trolley. I would like to see more light rail throughout San Diego. Thanks!
The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
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Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Christine A. Clark

Address: 1810 Denver St

City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92110

Phone: (619) 275-2101

E-mail: cac.lark@flash.net

* Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I support the mid-coast trolley. I would like to see more light rail throughout San Diego.

Thanks!
a proposal for the consideration of a

Blue and Gold Alternative
for the Midcoast Corridor

ver. 01, May 25, 2010

* This conceptual presentation is intended only to promote further discussion and subsequent more thoroughgoing analysis of other possible alternative solutions to the MidCoast Corridor design.

The ideas contained herein reflect the views of Ken Daniszewski, (kendaniszewski@yahoo.com) only and do not necessarily those of any other individual, organization or group.
Introduction

The conceptual alternative presented in this document is a multi-modal approach to the MidCoast Corridor.

Mode 1 is the extension of the Blue Line Trolley to the edge of the economically booming UTC / UCSD / BioTech Cluster zone.

Mode 2 is a zero-emissions rubber-wheel electric trolley, dubbed the "Gold Line" or the "Golden Triangle Line", running principally on a dedicated / private right of way loop within this zone and connecting the UTC Transit Center, the Sorrento Valley Coaster Station, and the Torrey Pines Research Mesa via fast, traffic-free right-of-ways.

The principle advantages of the Blue and Gold Alternative include:

- Much better service to a much larger community
- Less costly than the LRT-only alternatives
- More flexible system to adapt to possible future needs
THE PROBLEM:

The Need:
- The thriving areas of University City, UCSD, and the surrounding BioTech cluster have seen massive economic growth in recent decades.
- A new start is needed to better integrate these areas into San Diego’s public transit system.

The LRT dilemma:
- LRT is an ideal solution for connecting the UTC/UCSD/Biotech Cluster area with the transit system to the south,

  However,

- LRT is a terrible solution for any movement within this the UTC/UCSD/Biotech Cluster area

Inherent problems with using LRT within the UTC/UCSD/Biotech Cluster area:
- LRT requires extremely costly construction, such as for new bridges and trolley stops.
- LRT is comparatively noisy
- LRT has gradability issues.
- LRT not well suited for the multi-directional and frequent-stops needed by commuters within this zone.

The Result: LRT can only marginally satisfy the latent demand for public transportation connectivity within the UTC / UCSD / BioTech Cluster area.

THE BLUE AND GOLD ALTERNATIVE:

Conceptual model:

The Blue and Gold alternative consists of

- The extension of the existing Blue Line to access the UTC / UCSD / BioTech Cluster zone

  augmented with,

- A new Gold Line, a rubber-wheel, electric trolley system with its own separate and dedicated right-of-way system to move commuters rapidly within the zone.
One possible configuration for the "Blue and Gold" alternative
ADVANTAGES OF THE BLUE AND GOLD ALTERNATIVE:

- Gold Line eligible for FTA New Start funding as a dedicated right-of-way system.
- Vastly improved access to rail transit for major employers such as:
  - The Scripps Research Institute,
  - The Salk Institute,
  - Scripps Green Hospital,
  - The California Institute of Regenerative Medicine,
  - and many more.
- Faster and significantly less expensive to build than current LRT alternatives.
- Conveniently connects south-bound Coaster ridership with the UTC Transit Center.
- Potential to reduce rush-hour traffic north of UCSD, on the I-5, the 101 and Genesee Drive.
- No more Sorrento Valley Coaster shuttles stuck in heavy traffic.
- Greatly improved Coaster access for many north-bound riders, such as people working in UTC.
- Blue / Gold transfer delays can be minimized in a well-designed system.
- Improved transit options within the BioTech Cluster will stimulate economic growth.
- Improved neighborhood livability as residents can reduce driving and being stuck in traffic.
- Reduced environmental contamination from cars and other vehicles.
San Diego Biotech Companies Are Clustered Around Research Institutes
STRATEGIC LOCATION

With hundreds of biotech, communications, software & information technology companies, San Diego hosts over 160,000 high-tech jobs & the nation's highest concentration of wireless employment.

Home to 18 research institutions & over 500 life science companies, San Diego is ranked as the #1 bioscience cluster in the US.

UCSD is the hub of Torrey Pines Mesa, one of the most prolific & collaborative research zones in the nation.

Scientists at the prestigious Salk Institute, Scripps Research Institute, Neurosciences Institute & Burnham Institute – all on Torrey Pines Mesa – are closely tied to the university's research community.

Three hospitals & over 400 pharmaceutical, wireless & biotech companies are located in the science research zone surrounding campus.
San Diego is a Cluster of Innovation

- San Diego, nicknamed "Wireless Mecca," has been ranked by the Milken Institute as one of the nation's most productive and diverse areas in the biotech field.

- A 2001 U.S. Council on Competitiveness study identified San Diego as a "cluster of innovation" that has benefited from a "culture of collaboration." UCSD and UCSD CONNECT were singled out as prime movers behind the region's economic growth and technological dominance.
FAST-CHARGE ELECTRIC TROLLEY

Battery-electric propulsion is the cleanest, quietest and most economical propulsion method available today. Driving range is approximately 45 miles between charges, which can be accomplished in about 30 minutes with the Ebus-built 90 KW Fast-Charger.

The electric trolley is ideal on urban circulator routes, university campuses, or in residential neighborhoods where the very low noise level is appreciated. The 22 foot long trolley accommodates 22 seated passengers and 10 standees.

Regenerative braking increases the energy efficiency of the trolley by returning energy to the battery system whenever the vehicle is decelerating.

Low maintenance nickel cadmium batteries provide about 45 miles of operation between charges and have a life expectancy of up to 2,000 cycles.

The Ebus 22 foot Fast-Charge Electric Trolley starts at $305,000, plus taxes and shipping. The 90KW Fast-Charger is priced at $58,000 and can support multiple buses or trolleys.

To learn more about the Fast-Charge Electric Trolley, please click here to download a brochure.

One possible vehicle for the "Golden Triangle" loop
Sanford Consortium Breaks Ground

By Mika Ono

In a ceremony on March 26, the Sanford Consortium for Regenerative Medicine broke ground on its new building on Torrey Pines Scenic Drive, located on a gorgeous site overlooking the Pacific Ocean.

"The Sanford Consortium is the embodiment of community effort, [it] working together in the spirit of collaboration," said Edward Holmes, the consortium's president and CEO. "This is a wonderful day for San Diego."

The new $115-million, 145,000-square-foot facility will bring together stem cell researchers and other scientists from The Scripps Research Institute, Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute, the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, and the University of California, San Diego (UCSD).

Among the more than 100 people attending the groundbreaking event—which took place with construction ongoing in the background—were civic leaders and benefactors who helped drive the formation of the consortium. These included South Dakota businessman and philanthropist T. Denny Sanford, local businessman Malin Burnham, Padres owner and philanthropist John Moores, Qualcomm co-founder Irwin Jacobs, California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) oversight committee chair Robert Klein, and San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders. The governor provided a proclamation of his support.

"There will be cures for several diseases here, not in the next few days, not in the next few years, but ultimately this will make a big difference because we will have the best minds working together," said Sanford, who gave $30 million to support the project. "This is the medicine of the future."

The consortium was first formed in March 2006 to expand collaborative work in stem cell research and to facilitate its translation into clinical cures, following voters' approval of Proposition 71 in November 2004. the new facility will be designed to be 16 months.

For more information on the Sanford Consortium, see http://www.sanfordconsortium.org/

Send comments to: mikaono@scripps.edu
I like this idea immensely, but 6 yrs. is way too long to wait. On the other hand we waited a long time for the completion of the current LRT & I think it was well worth the wait. I use all of the current LRT system a lot. I go all over SanDiego [sic] on all the lines for shopping & paying bills & I enjoy & appreciate being able to go wherever I want, whenever I want. Thank you for finally starting something to go north from Old Town to UTC. I think something like the LRT along the I-15 Corridor from downtown S.D. to Escondido would be just as beneficial and economical.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: CHARLES HEISMAN

Address: 72, 17TH ST, APT. #411 - BOX 58

City: SAN DIEGO State: CA Zip: 92101 - 7672

Phone:

E-mail:

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I like this idea immensely but 6 yrs. is way too long to wait. On the other hand we waited a long time for the completion of the current LRT and I think it was well worth the wait. I use all of the current LRT system a lot. I go all over Sandiego on all the lines for shopping & paying bills & I enjoy being able to go wherever I want whenever I want. Thank you for finally starting something to go north from Old Town to UTC. I think something like the LRT along the I-15 corridor from Downtown SD to Escondido would be just as beneficial & economical.
Name: Ron Mann
Address: 22-17th #216
City: SD
State: CA
Zip: 92101-7671
Phone: 619.696.3616
E-mail:

Comments:

I think this is a very good idea. I like LRT-Alternative 1 [sic] it covers most of the areas in the La Jolla Dr. area where I go visit or have appoints. Good luck with every thing. You have my vote. Thank you. Ron Mann
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: 

Address: 

City: SAN DIEGO State: CA. zip: 92101-7671

Phone: (619) 699-3616

E-mail: 

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I think this is a very good idea. I like LRT Alternative! It covers most of the areas in the La Jolla UA where I go to visit or have appointments. Good luck with everything. You have my vote.

Thank you.
Name: Ross A. Clark  
Address: 3552 Cowley Way  
City: SD  
State: CA  
Zip: 92117  
Phone:  
E-mail: macclark@san.rr.com

Comments:

I really appreciate for [sic] scoping presentation to learn more about a couple of routes. I prefer LRT Alternative 1 (1, 4, 5) as [sic] greater access to many places in U.C. area. Alternative LRT route 3 is more limited but requires other forms of public transit-buses.

Thanks.
HELP IMPROVE MOBILITY IN
THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR

The SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has entered an important phase, during which public input will contribute to the decision-making process. The Scoping Period for the project began on May 3, 2010, and will continue through June 1, 2010.

There are several ways to submit formal comments to SANDAG during the Scoping Period. Complete the form below and return to staff at a Scoping Meeting, or you may submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax to SANDAG:

Mail: Mid-Coast Comments, SANDAG, 401 B Street, Ste. 800, San Diego, CA 92101
E-mail: midcoast@sandag.org
Phone: (619) 595-5620
Fax: (619) 699-1905
Web site: www.sandag.org/midcoast

Name: Ross A. Clark

Address: 3552 Cowley Way

City: San Diego State: CA Zip: 92117

Phone: 

E-mail: macelaks@san.org.com

☐ Please add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.
I really appreciate for scoping presentation to learn more about a couple of routes. I prefer LRT - Alternative 1 (1, 4, 5) for greater access to many places in the U.C. area. Alternative LRT route 3 is more limited but requires other forms of public transit - buses.

Thanks.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: One of my main concerns is, is it going to be a shuttle service between the station and VA Hospital? So that would be something.

My concern is for me and my fellow Veterans, like the guys in the wheelchairs and everything, you know, they can't -- if it's going to be two, three boxes, it won't be of any value to them. That's my main concern.

Also, to see availability, is it going to be to the VA Hospital for us Vets?

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Just want to say that I think alternative No. 1, which I believe would be the best alternative. I think it would get the most ridership from the students and the UCSD area, and I figure the shoppers perhaps won't mind waiting a few more minutes. Students are a little more in a hurry to get to where they're going. I think that would be the greatest
benefit.

For me personally, any one of these would work for me, but I think that's what would work the best. So I think serving the students first, shoppers could wait a few extra minutes.

And if it's the people that live in the UCSD area that are working their way downtown, they're a little bit better managing their time. I would think that the students, those are the ones that -- is the only real thought I had wanted to pass along.

Thank you.

(Whereupon the Mid-Coast Scoping meeting concluded.)
I, Gloria D. Mazon, C.S.R. No. 9356, hereby certify, that the foregoing statements from this public hearing were recorded true to the best of my ability by electronic transcription, and supervised under my supervision.

Dated in San Diego, California, this 28th day, of October, 2010

Gloria D. Mazon
CSR No. 9356
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

TAKEN ON: TUESDAY MAY, 11, 2010

TAKEN AT: 9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: GLORIA D. MAZON.
CSR NO. 9356

SANDAG MID-COAST SCOPING MEETING
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Richard Vanfleet. I live at 8642 Villa La Jolla Drive, La Jolla. And I just want to voice a couple of comments.

My opposition of the Trolley coming up to this area, I personally -- oh, where do I want to go with this? I'm concerned what's going -- the activities, the traffic is already so bad in my neighborhood right now due to the Super buses and the college students are now coming in parking their cars on the street and taking the free SuperLoop buses to the college and it's just the noise level in my neighborhood, that is my biggest complaint.

And I feel that if the Trolley comes, it's only going to double the traffic, people not only driving maybe down from the northern, you know, like Carlsbad driving down to park their car in our neighborhoods, which there is no parking facility, so to speak in our neighborhood, just the college kids. It's just basically what they've done, is turn my neighborhood into a park
and ride and I'm opposed to that, obviously.

And the noise of these buses, the SuperLoop bus, Bus 201, Bus 202, the noise, it runs up and down my street 180 times a day, the bus was put in the neighborhood supposedly for people, residents like me to take to the mall, to take to shopping, to take to work, but that's not what it's being used for, these buses are being used to shuttle the college students who come park in this neighborhood. They park at the Ralph's, they park all up and down Villa La Jolla and they park all over the street, there's no parking when college is in session, and they take the free bus transportation to college. And I just feel by having this Trolley coming through this neighborhood, it is only going to increase the traffic, more traffic, you know, it's just miserable to get around my neighborhood now that it is. But that was one of my biggest complaint.

And I had one other thing I wanted to offer about that, and where did I go with this? Hang on just a second.

I'm worried about the crime portion if it's a little bit, you know, you hear about a lot of crime being associated with the Trolley and maybe, you know, that's what I'm concerned about. But other than that, I'm just -- it's just the noise factor. It's just -- I'm
just opposed to that. I'm not trying -- you know, what I'm saying. I just don't appreciate how its turned out with this SuperLoop. But I think it's all connected together and I think once the Trolley comes, they're going to add more of these noisy buses running up and down the street, you know, and it's just -- its just definitely affected my quality of life. I've come to the point, where I almost have to try to sell my place to avoid this, the noise is unbelievable and that's really all I wanted to say.

I just oppose it, because I just think it's only going to add more traffic, more congestion in this neighborhood, people come from all over the -- you know, to park their cars here, and maybe take their car downtown, whatever, take the shuttle or whatever that's called, the Trolley down to Old Town, you know, to the ballpark and things like that. I'm just concerned about the traffic in the neighborhood.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: MY first name is Dale, Disharoon. And I reside at 8638-4 Villa La Jolla Drive in La Jolla, so local area residence here. I'm actually an employee here at UCSD.

The first concern we have is the noise, and not
only as the Mid-Coast Corridor or the Trolley comes up to
grade over to I-5, back of La Jolla Square Mall, but also
along where La Jolla Colony is, we're going to need
required, or excuse me, we're going to require the sound
walls so it keeps the sound radiating into the freeway
and not onto the residences.

Okay. We understand from these meetings, I've
already been to one of them, that that is a concern
throughout our community, is going to be the noise. So
we would very much like SANDAG -- and I believe Helix
Environmental is doing the acoustic testing on this, or
whoever is doing the acoustical -- needs to be especially
sensitive to this area because there's a lot -- we have a
lot of condominiums. We have 18 condominiums
associations in our area west of I-5 and there's the
whole La Jolla Colony area; first issue, sound walls.

Second, parking. Since the SuperLoop has come
into our area, we now have the greater San Diego area
parking in our area to jump on local transportation to
then go onto UCSD; 90 percent of the ridership on the
SuperLoop bus system right now is UCSD passovers, coming
into our area, mostly parking and then going onto USCD
coming home at night, getting back into their cars and
then leaving.

At the Nobel Station, we're going to be in
requirement or need of a quite large parking structure, probably in the neighborhood of 1-to-2,000 parking spaces, not only for the folks that are going to be, or the people that are going to be coming up and not going onto UCSD, but choosing to park in the parking lots around us and then coming back to their cars because they're very attached to their cars, but also for events that happen in the future, because we're going to be the most northern part of this transportation system when they start serving items like events in San Diego, football games, baseball games, they're going to be coming into our community parking, getting on the Trolley and going south. We know this. We know this is going to happen.

And I also, as a Veteran, we as a community and SANDAG and the Mid-Coast Corridor Project needs to work diligently to have a stop that's closer, if not right at the VA Hospital.

Right now, there's at least a two-block walk for Veterans to get to the hospital, and shuttles just aren't the right way to do it. We need to -- well, let me back up a little bit.

This planning stage is the ideal time to make sure that that connection happens directly to the VA Hospital for the Veteran's, because there will be a lot
of ridership for the the Veteran's. We have the
Regional, the Southern Regional Desert, Southern Regional
VA Hospital, and the Vets don't have -- are not going to
have direct access with the transportation system. Those
are the three areas.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: My name is Fiona Kitson.
My address is 8638 Unit-5, Villa La Jolla Drive, La Jolla
92037.

And my main concern is like Dale, is the noise,
and on the area that they do everything to prevent the
noise, disturbing all the residents, okay.

And secondly, the parking because we are
already experiencing a lot of parking problems. So it's
the parking.

And, yeah, the stop at the hospital. So that's
it.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: So my comment is, that I
don't like Alternative 3, because it goes to UTC before
UCSD and it would take longer for people to get to
campus. And I believe that more people would be coming
on the Trolley to campus than to UTC. So I think that
they should look at using an alternative that goes
directly from the south to UCSD.

   Thank you.

   ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I'd like to ensure that no
UC funds are used for this project. And I'd like to
ensure when the construction happens, that Union
employees are used for construction, because we need to
have living wages in San Diego.

   Thank you.

   ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: First of all, I really like
the fact that they're connecting Old Town with UCSD;
however, there's a couple of comments I had about
the canyon, it's called the West Canyon Station.

   The West Canyon Station goes through a really
important canyon on campus. We have an urban farm
sitting there, and I'm wondering if SANDAG has taken that
into consideration.

   And also, if UCSD has taken that into
consideration, and if they've outreached the student
community and know what the impacts of going through our
urban farm is.

   So I would really advise that they look at
that. We're pretty passionate about our urban farm, so
I'm wondering if they're willing to get some subsidies for relocating the urban farm, or maybe working with the urban farm and where the station is going to be placed, maybe keep the urban farm and keep the station, but somehow find like a connection between the two, maybe have like an urban farm right next to the station or a garden or something to keep that.

So hopefully SANDAG or UCSD is taking that into consideration.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Just that I can't drive anymore, so this is absolutely critical. There are only two things that I would like to see added that are not being addressed here.

One, I noticed just about all of the alternatives go past the VA, there's no station at the VA and a lot of those folks, I say the majority of them, because I see they get on and off the buses, get past in wheelchairs, walkers, some kind of walking aid. There's no reason to not have a stop at the VA for these folks. That's absolutely critical.

And the other thing, I know it's not part of this right now, but, we need public transportation up to Carmel Valley, there is nothing there, it's zero. No
buses, no trains, nothing.

And, you know, that's a fully and inhabited operational development, it's big. There is zero public transportation out there. The one reason we bought here, because I can't drive and we wanted to live in Carmel Valley, but I'd be trapped. It's only five miles, but there is zero transit, other than cars.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: So all right. My comment is, I would have liked to see more thorough documentation of why certain alternatives were picked over other alternatives, especially rail versus BRT, Bus Rail Transit.

So there is a chart that depicts the benefits of light rail versus the benefits of Bus Rapid Transit and it oversympathizes the comparison between the two, which is great for a simple informative session, but for a public view or a public information session, information regarding how they model those numbers, came up with those numbers, would be very beneficial because those numbers were crucial to the decision of making light rail over rapid bus transportation.

So thank you.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I guess my comment would be that it would be nice if there was a stop somewhere near Rose Canyon, like the bottom of Gilman. Gilman and I-5, would be a lot more convenient. We need more stops between Balboa Avenue and La Jolla Village Square, because it's a long way to go without any stops.

Other than that, it sounds pretty good, you know, but it won't be as convenient for me as if there were a stop somewhere in the middle there.

If they do put a stop somewhere around 52 and I-5 or Gilman and I-5, that would be nice.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: So my name is Stephanie Alaimo.

And I'm a graduate student at UCSD. I am 25 years old. And I really rely on public transit. And I have to say that we really, really need an expansion of public transit here in San Diego in general, but especially to connect this University to the rest of the community.

We have a lot of students here that don't necessarily have the means to have their own car all the time, this includes undergraduate students who, I mean, obviously, financial situation is difficult for anyone
that's in school, but also includes graduate students
because graduate students, we're old, you know, some of
us don't start till we're 30. I'm younger than that, but
lot of my colleagues got family. We live on minimum wage
or less every year. A lot of us are paid less than
shuttle drivers, so you can imagine how difficult that is
to have -- how difficult expenses can be.

And having lived in Europe for a significant
part of my 20s and spending a significant part of my
young life in Chicago as well, I really appreciate the
value and the service that's reliable, safe and
affordable -- excuse me --

(Telephonic interruption)

-- reliable and safe and affordable public transit is.
It links communities together. It helps build the things
to be done and it makes everything work more accessible;
imAGining what the University could do for the City as
well as what the City could do for the University, is so
much more possible when we have something that links them
together. If it's difficult for people from the City,
people from the University, how could they ever benefit
from things like the Scripps Clinic, the Aquarium?
There's an art gallery here on campus, there's also a
theatre. But these things are completely inaccessible to
the people that live in the city that can't come up.
And so, this is a real problem when we talk about, you know, what the University means in this century, in this age, wanting a public University or wanting anything that's funded by tax dollars, that needs to be, you know, accessible to as many people as possible, that includes students and the public people as well.

So I am a very strong supporter of linking the public transit or the city with the University via public transit.

This is important on weekends too. I can't even come up here on the weekends, because it takes me almost two hours to get here on the bus, so it's unbelievable sure; it's true. It's quite a burden.

If it weren't for the shuttle that the University provided down from Hillcrest, it would be even more difficult. I do take the city buses into town, but they have a very limited service, which is very unfortunate.

So making everything more accessible isn't good for everyone, tourist included, right? This is a very touristic city. So tourists, maybe they come and rent cars when they're here, but not necessarily. So that's it. Go public transit!

Thank you.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Frederick Raab.

I live in La Jolla. I work at the University, and I just want to say, I'm all in favor of it. I'm a great supporter of rapid transit. I've lived in Washington DC when they put the metro in. It's all the differences that the metro made and all, you know, the people who were saying, "Let's -- let me get my thoughts organized.

Basically, people didn't realize the changes that were going to happen, they just focused on the near term and totally missed all the economic growth that was going to bring into the city.

And likewise, then I moved to Boston and saw the expansion of the Red Line and the Orange Line in Boston, and again, the ridership and economic growth and development.

And so, I just think people need to be aware of the long term benefits. And it might be 5, 10, 20 years out, but it's worth the investment now. And they should have done it long ago when they first built the Trolley. I don't see why they think, follow the right of way; likewise, they should have double-tracked the commuter rail. I mean, that should have been double-tracked all the way up to Oceanside.

Thank you.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Florentino Guizar is my name.

And I have a comment about one of the alternatives, the one that makes kind of like a shape towards University and then continues. I think that's No 6, bad move. Not cost-effective, that's my comment.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I struggle to come and make this comment. This is very and vital and very important to everybody in the County who takes public transportation. It's city bus MTS or at the Trolley. I know there are two, but one for capital improvement, one for operation. And now, they are planning to have connection for Mid-Corridor Old Town to UCSD, this section. That's a capital improvement.

I would speak first this MTS Department. All around city, many routes connecting to Fashion Valley, University City, San Ysidro, major connection, why not Oceanside, with the train, bus, Trolley connection?

Now, all these places have a clean restroom for persons to use. Daytime people can go to store, a nearby store, if they are open for business, but that is not a very practical way. I cannot find any restrooms in any place. When they construct bus or Trolley system, how
come you didn't think about human beings need restroom? We need to eat, we need to drink, we need to discharge anytime.

I make a special trip to the bus from UTC to Oceanside, and from Oceanside to Trolley to Escondido one day. I just for fun and to see because they are very proud. The Oceanside Sprinter, the Trolley system is new and modest, and I pay attention to every stop, there was no one. No restroom stop. If passengers travel and have emergency and after 9:00 and no store open, where you are going to go?

Trolley, bus, not restroom; not like an Amtrak, long distance they have restroom, but with this kind of local County-wide system, zero.

Now, we are human beings and I keep saying we are human beings. In office, at school, you teach one hour, break time 15 minutes, why? You need to go to restroom, right? But the Trolley travel this long, no place.

At Old Town, Fashion Valley, main Trolley buses connect. I notice MTS had a portable restroom for bus drivers. Now, bus driver is a human body, passengers are human body. You know how to treat driver, you don't know how to treat passengers, why? This Public Transit System is to general public. No passengers won't have driver.
Why you put driver and you do not passenger?
Driver/passenger, which one is which, right?

I am not saying every stop need a restroom, every two stops, you must have a restroom. And also, this must indicate on the bus schedule route or Trolley routes, "There is a restroom." "There is a restroom." People come, look at the map. If I have money, I can use it.

I took Trolley one day from Fashion Valley to East County and a man need urgent need to go to men's room. He just jump off the Trolley and the Trolley stop and he just jump out the Trolley and he discharge on the property. I could see his body. He just open up to do next, but not the woman.

At the Fashion Valley Trolley Station, which is a very heavy station, heavily used.

The construction good idea, the Trolley not go up 50 feet or 60 feet above the us, the street behind Town and Country Hotel. Original structure I could see they need two elevators, but they only put one elevator, only one and it's so old, there's no restroom. Put bus, Trolley after 9:00 because they open until maybe midnight, passengers no restroom. People use that elevator as a restroom. If you go in there even now, you smell, you read and everything.
Now, about two years ago, somebody had made a complaint, I guess, because I see in the morning if I go there, the elevator wash -- somebody wash early morning, early night, but still you cannot wash because you read. There are many people that read, sit through the wall size into -- there's nowhere to walk, except put a new elevator.

In the morning you go there to elevator, you see -- if I come back in the afternoon after 8:30, 9:00, walk, somebody urine already inside the elevator; sometimes by 8:30, 9:00 somebody urine outside of the elevator near entrance, and that elevator sometimes not working condition, out of service and, you know what? It's 53 steps. If a mother have small baby, she cannot cramp her stroller up and down, cannot; and elevator is out of service. Original construction I saw two elevators, you put only one elevator.

The other space was used as a snack, but people sell coffee, tea, cookies, snacks, they have two original but only put one, so there was another space, right? So that space was used for a small store, convenience store.

Now, if you to go Fashion Valley, that same store, convenience store, MTS built a small convenient store away from that elevator, so there's a new one that say, "MTS cafe."
But I don't know now what they're going to do with this original space, because they need elevator, two elevators to serve the public. If you have one and one is out of service, you make second one for you, especially for older people or mother with children.

Now, you have money to trying to build extension, you know, this is extension Old Town to UCSD, with the older route, you need to put restroom, not every station, not every stop, but every two stops.

Now, that would serve the public needs. I travel, made a special trip to see Fashion Valley to East County from Fashion Valley to North County to south border San Ysidro, none, no restrooms. Drivers at the Fashion Valley or Old Town, MTS have portable for them, you know, like a construction site, they can have a key to open. Now, drivers need to use restroom, passengers underserved.

I am speaking for the sudden majority, from my personal actual experience and need it to be corrected or improved. If you are going to make a good system to serve the public, it's not just have a new Trolley or just a new bus, you need to serve these kind of basic human needs; 53 steps to go to climb high to the platform to take Trolley at the Fashion Valley, and the elevator is too old.
(Whereupon the Mid-Coast Scoping meeting concluded.)
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ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Yes. I am against the project. They are on the canyon, which I understand the Trolley tracks are being used to transport the cars down through Rose Canyon, right? Rose Canyon now has the majority of people that are living there on the hillsides on both sides, most of those people are retired people that have been living there for many years. They've worked all their lives to get that property, and they bought that property for the quietness and serenity of the area.

This is -- I don't know, if that's going to give them a lot of noise -- this is a situation where their property values are going to go downward spiral, people are not going to listen to that noise if they want, you know, sell their home or something, they're going to have difficulty selling their home for people that are aware of this situation.

And the other thing is, of course, there's much wildlife there that's going to be disrupted by -- how
many trains would go by in a day? Do you have any idea?
So, yeah. I'll be back. I'm going to see the rest of
the stations.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: What I'm concerned about in
a way, I like coming up here because I take public
transit. But what I am concerned about, is with the
Trolley, is not much policing and people getting on and
off, and so a lot of people getting on and off for free.
And what I'm concerned about, is getting more graffiti up
here. With the buses, you got to pay to get on the bus,
Trolley, there's a lot of people getting on the Trolley
without paying.

And so, I noticed wherever the Trolley goes,
there seems to be graffiti, so that's my concern.

So if it's not a better system for people
getting on and off the Trolley, there's too many people
getting on-and-off without paying and so, that makes it
easier for the people that do the graffiti to get up this
way. And I hate to see this area -- there's no graffiti
up here right now. I'd hate to see much graffiti up
here.

Thank you.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I want to add something, you had mentioned that the frequency of the trains will be 15 minutes, but down the road, it's going to be every seven-and-a-half minutes in 2015. I believe that's what the other people said here, so that's another noise factor that's going to be more prevalent at that time.

So can you add that to my comment? One gentleman brought up the fact that while all this is going to take place, there's quantity of people involved in getting this project put together.

Now, the salaries for all these people, who's going to pay all the salaries for all these people? And how will these salaries continue after the project gets completed? I'd like to have that information.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I just was a little concerned, because I used to be on the UCSD campus doing things as a student, and then the La Jolla area and UCSD does a lot of research, and I was just concerned do we really want nonaffiliation, UCSD affiliated riders to come onto the campus easily? I know it's already being proposed that they would like to rather pass the east and pass through the campus or end up in the campus. But yeah, I think we should consider possibly the route that goes to the east. And I think it's LRT3, which is the --
the terminal is UCSD, because that would drop off the
riders who are just going to the shopping center first
and just leave the people who are really UCSD-bound,
going towards the University; yeah.

I know there's students that would use it, but
we're not, like, we're not exactly the same as SDSU.
SDSU is actually a larger University, and there's a lot
of people who are spread out that, you know, in the beach
areas and things like that, so there's a lot of ridership
coming in between that, but I don't know. I guess UCSD
would benefit having transportation. I just remember we
already have a loop, a bus loop in the La Jolla area that
if you're living within the La Jolla area, there's
already some kind of access, and I know the Coaster goes
a little bit farther north to Sorento Valley, but if we
could maybe make use of the existing, or improving the
link or the nexus between the Coaster and the University
or publicizing it, I don't know, making stops along the
way. I'm just -- I think light rail is good for mass
transit, but yeah. I'm just thinking of the
accessibility issues for the University, maybe if we
would have like, like the UCSD has a bus pass for UCSD
students and UCSD affiliates, you know, that's kind of --
you could see that the ridership was really predominantly
people affiliated with UCSD versus -- I know, it would be
interesting to have tourists and other people who would want to come around, but I think tourists are more interested in coming to Sea World than to UCSD.

And, you know, I think, yeah, you know, the tourists, I've seen them, they go to SDSU, Qualcomm Stadium, east, I don't know. It's a different population of people. There's talk about minimizing the disruption to the current roads that are in existence because I know most of them go into railways, right-of-ways already, so that's kind of taken into account.

I don't know, there was one option where it would be underground or above ground in the UTC area. I was just thinking how that would look underground, that would be covered up but above ground, I don't know, would it look like Grantville, around there, would it look like that? It's hard for me to imagine how it would look, the Trolley coming through the area.

That's basically it. Accessibility issues about the type of riders that are coming out to the campus.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Anything that doesn't make me wait, where the place that I have to wait is safe, simple.
ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: First name is Erik, last name is Ruehr. And I live in San Diego, if that matters. I'm in favor of the project and I support the alternative that's called, "LRT1."
And that's basically it.
Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: My name is Pat Herron. I've lived in San Diego all my life. I would be very, very much against Alternative No. 3, LR3 that goes right through the middle of Rose Canyon. I have hiked in that canyon, people have taken me down there for walks of the Audubon Society and pointed out many different species.
The Rose Canyon is a very important area. We have many endangered species in that canyon, people have worked for years. There's friends of Rose Canyon, there's Audubon Society, people have literally worked for years taking out weeds and invasive species from that area, plants and trees and species, to improve that area so we can bring some of our more endangered species of animals, so we can bring them back. These areas are disappearing right and left.
Like I said, I grew up here. I lived across the street from the canyon most of my childhood, and we could go down there and see horn toes, snakes, lizards,
birds, all kinds of creatures, many of which live only in
the San Diego area. I can't go back to that canyon, that
canyon is gone. It's been filled in and built on top of,
and we are losing these canyons right and left. We
cannot afford to lose these, you know, treasures.
Basically, our canyon -- many people are working very
hard in our canyon lands. We cannot afford to lose them.

As far as I'm concerned, Alternative No. 3, I
would fight that tooth and nail, and so would many of the
people that have been involved and working in these
areas.

It appears that Alternative No. 1, avoids
many -- most of the problems with environmentally
sensitive land species, it's mostly an aerial kind of
rail set up. I'm for mass transit. I'm for light rail.
I think it's great, but Alternative No. 1 seems to be
very mindful of, you know, preserving the areas in San
Diego that we need to preserve and not have an impact on
our endangered species and canyon lands that are so
important.

If you cannot go with one, looks like No. 6
would be the next most acceptable. But absolutely, LRT
No. 3, we would fight that till our dying breath.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I have one, and that's the
Trolley Station, that looks like it's on Nobel Drive.
And my concern is an increase in crime, it
might be associated with a Trolley Station. Now I did
hear yeah, if you have a station, there's people coming
and going, there's going to be crimes because it was
never there before.

My question is, there's a lot of residential
area close by, and so, has there been any studies in
increased crime that spills out into residential
neighborhoods that might be a result of the Trolley
station being closed? You know, the place where somebody
doesn't even have a car can jump on a Trolley, go to a
high density residential area, you know, break in, steal
a couple of computers and some jewelry, get back on the
Trolley and gone. And that's kind of the nature of my
question.

So, it wouldn't be hard to look at a police
report and looking into the station and, you know, nobody
seems to state that that has been done, but I did hear it
wouldn't have been hard to do. So, that's my comment.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: My biggest concern is the
impact in the neighborhood of the Trolley stations that
are going to be put in at the base of Balboa, not only in
terms of the parking, it's the capacity of that
particular parking lot that gets filled out, which is estimated to be 250, people are going to be parking on the side streets. They're going to be using the residential streets around it, and the impact of attracting people into the neighborhood that might ride the Trolley from anywhere south to the border, coming into our neighborhood to steal stuff, hop on that Trolley and they're gone.

So no longer are we dependent upon people having a car to come into our neighborhood, but a license plate to be able to track them in and out of the area. We got people that come in and ride the Trolley in and ride the Trolley out. There also, does not appear to be any efficient way get individuals from Pacific Beach, pedestrian traffic to the Trolley Station, they have to go through a very dangerous area underneath the overpass, there's Interstate 5. And the individuals that are going to be using that are -- it's my understanding that the people that are there, they've located these Trolley stations there, because they want to be able to track people from Pacific Beach, but there's no way that if that does succeeds, that they're going to be able to have parking there be sufficient.

The impact of noise on our neighborhood. We hear stuff that happens down on Mission Bay all the time,
when there's any kind of amplified music. We already
hear the trains that are down there at the bottom of the
hill, the trollies are just going to add to that noise
that carries up into the hill. It's like an amphitheater
above that.

So anything to be done to minimize the noise
impact, the hours that the Trolley is going to be
operating, is going to have an impact on our
neighborhood, our entire neighborhood there, which is the
area on the southeast corner of Balboa and Morena
Boulevard. We fought viciously against that Trolley
Station being put in there some 10 years ago, when we got
the card here last week, which was the first we heard
that it actually was going in and it appears that the
cars already -- the horses have already left the barn,
that we're stuck with it being there and there's no
choice in the matter.

We're vehemently against it. We don't want the
Trolley Station down there. They're going to need to put
up at least a signal down there, because the traffic that
travels on Morena Boulevard there, travels at about 50
mile an hour. There's no way you're going to be able to
have in and out access to a parking lot there without
putting on a signal, and that's just going to slow down
our access to the freeways that we enjoy now without
having any signals whatsoever to deal with. You're not going to get any ridership from our neighborhood. We'd have to walk down the hill and hike that back up 230 feet above sea level to get to our houses, so nobody in our neighborhood is going to walk down there and walk back up.

There is no multifamily housing anywhere near that. And I really doubt that the ridership, if you're going to get to this Trolley already going to keep the people in our neighborhood or if the people in Pacific Beach, if they don't have some other form of transportation to get there. They've got buses already.

The buses as far as I'm concerned, are working fine. I think a lot of the assumptions that the projects are based on, are simply wrong. I'm the assumption of the ridership, I've been told that they need 20,000 trips a day to make this viable. Anytime I've ridden the Trolley or the bus, the riderships are grossly less than what people expect it and the individuals that are riding them, are rather shady characters, that you don't want to be riding them. I wouldn't want my wife or daughter or anybody else to be riding the bus or a Trolley.

I was told that the individuals that are going to be riding these trolleys are going to be of a higher caliber, if they're coming from UCSD, and that's all fine
and good, that's when they're leaving UCSD, but the individuals that are coming from using the Trolley is a source of access to our neighborhood, where they can easily get on the Trolley, get into the neighborhood, go up and steal something, hop on the next Trolley and go back where they're going, is going to attract crime.

We had a major problem in our neighborhood with the Detox Center that they wanted to put in on the other side of the freeway, and everybody objected to it. This is going to attract the same sort of an element. We already have a transient population that live down there in and around underneath the bridges and the areas where this Trolley is located.

The 250 cars that are going to be parked during the day, the parking lot is full. It's going to attract more crime to the area. The parking lots are euphemistically known as "park and steals" because they know that anybody that parks their car there is not going to be reporting it stolen until later on that night, so they got all day long to ride around in a stolen car. So you're going to attract an element to that neighborhood that are going to steal cars out of there and once they start stealing of out there, they'll come into our neighborhoods and start burglarizing the houses and stealing cars. And we've got a nice neighborhood, and
now it's just going to attract a criminal element through the area that we haven't seen before.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I think the Red Line would be the best option. And just, good job to everyone here; appreciate all their efforts. I know this is a great undertaking, so...

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Well, it's not -- how do I explain this? We're not looking for the future with this system. We're ending it like this.

So you want to go up to Sorento Valley eventually? Well, don't do this segment coming back this way, just go directly to Sorento Valley, and then do like two -- like the trains that are coming up here will be an A and B Train. One train will go this way (indicating), one train will go up Sorento Valley. This train will go to the new Mira Mar Airport someday, and the Marines are gonna go vertical takeoff pretty soon. They won't need Mira Mar for their touch-and-go practice anymore, because they won't be doing the aircraft carriers that way within next 20 years. All their planes will be vertical takeoff.

So they won't be doing the touch-and-go pattern
over the dump anymore. So that means, they can build
onto that and make a commercial airport. The Marines
will just need a hanger for their tankers and their troop
transport planes. Their own corner of the airport.

So unless you are aiming that way, and that's
supposed to go up to Mira Mesa eventually, right? I
mean, another 30 years, this is 10 years behind schedule
now.

Other than that, everything is good. Think of
putting the stop at Jutland Drive.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: The point that I would
make, is that this rail line seems to have no capture
point for getting people from I-5, they're coming down to
the University Town, UCSD area to pick them up on the
Trolley. I mean, to give them a place to park so they
can get onto the Trolley and make the rest of the ride
downtown.

And therefore, it would seem that a Trolley
stop with the big parking structure around the area of
I-5 and Genesee would be an ideal place to capture the
people, and it would require re-routing a little further
north to capture that. But I would think that that would
be a spot that would capture lots of people that were
going to go downtown via I-5, otherwise.

Another comment, is that with regard to Balboa Station, there's need for some way to get buses from that station across to Grand Avenue, flying across the Santa Fe tracks, I-5 and East Mission Bay Drive, so that all of those structures don't block the process, because you just take a bus from right where the train station is going to be and try to get it through the Garnet traffic structure here, it's probably going to use five-minute time on that, which may be just enough to push people into driving their personal vehicles the whole way, rather than taking public tranist.

Another thing about a Genesee Station at the Genesee and I-5 station, is that you would then be looking at a very short shuttle for a Coaster bus to go from this Sorento Valley Station up to the Genesee Trolley Station, and therefore, make it more likely these people would make that transfer to go to various places in the UCSD, UTC area using the Trolley system.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: So my comment is, I think that the yellow option I think is No. 6, is not preferable because it misses the station on Nobel Drive and the 5.
I also think that there's a need for a Coaster Station somewhere in UTC. And I think this can be done much quicker than, you know, finishing the whole Mid-Coast Corridor.

What else? I also want to make sure, that if eventually there is a connection with the airport that this corridor, the Mid-Coast Corridor, is going to stop in Old Town but it's going to go all the way down to at least Santa Fe Depot, so you could have connections to downtown, the airport and downtown. I think that's -- I think it's a great idea; yes.

So we've lived in UTC, in different places, like from Regents and now we live on Villa La Jolla, regardless of where we are, I think it's going to be a great thing. I think it's for most students and most people in the UTC area, they kind of feel cut out from the rest of the city. We have the time and we have the resources and we still don't go to downtown like more than, I don't know, once a month. And it's mainly because it's a pain to drive and find a parking space. So I think that's pretty much it.

Thank you.

(whereupon the Mid-Coast Scoping meeting concluded.)
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ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: My name is Jerry Selness. 92117, my zip code, if that's needed for consequence. Okay. The station at Balboa Avenue, that's a good one. Tecolote Station is a good one. This one in between, useless. Anybody who can go to this one can go to this one or go to that one (indicating), and there'd be a lot few people. You'd get a lot of people at this one.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: About the station, one comment I would like to add, is provide adequate parking, because there's no other way to get this for people who live up in La Mesa. The underground here (indicating), I don't think that'll go, okay. I don't think that'll really go. It's too bad, but it just won't go. It won't be really -- yeah, really be a mess, you know. I mean, if you can go this way and that way and come back this way (indicating) and that way, that's enough.

Okay. Alternative 3, is that the one? Yeah
Alternative 3, that requires undergrounding, that's a mess.

Other than that, I think it's really the thing to do. We're probably sure to use it, if it goes into play.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: My name is Ruth Crowell. And I live on Brandywine Street. And I feel that public transportation should be cheaper. And I think for the first couple years, it should be free, so people get used to using it, once they get in the habit of using it.

And I think that part of the money that goes to Caltrans should go to this, to the Trolley and to make it instead of having more lanes on the freeway, we need to spend more money on the Trolley and buses. And there should be smaller buses for handicap people, especially to get us from home to the Trolley and back home. And for bringing people up from Pacific Beach to the Trolley, to cut down on the traffic. I really think that we're far behind other cities in public transportation. We really need to get on the ball.

I'm retired. I don't use it everyday, but I have a caregiver who comes to my house from Lemon Grove. And she said, if there was a Trolley Station down there,
she would use it everyday, but she doesn't make very much money. So if the Trolley is more expensive than driving her own car, you know, she may not use it. But if the Trolley is priced fairly for people to really use it, it really would help everybody. I think it would get people used to using it.

Thank you.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: For future, would you consider some kind of a stop -- I don't know, I usually -- whenever I ride Amtrak from L.A. to San Diego, they run around Sunday afternoon, there's a whole lot of kids going back from UCSD and they get off on Solana Beach and they wait for their buddies to pick them up, so it would be -- there's a little stop in, where is that? Sorento Valley. There's a Coaster, something like that.

I mean, as the lady said, "I got to transfer from Amtrak to the Coaster and get off at Solana Beach, but there's no transportation."

I mean, there's a bus service from Solana Beach, from Sorento Valley to UCSD, but would you mind considering light rail from Solana -- no. Sorento Valley to UCSD, you know, for consideration. That's all.

Would you consider putting a little extra -- so essentially, I will be making that comment. I mean, I
talked to three people about it, but they may not remember. I am just putting a request.

Is that enough? Thanks.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: Okay. I'm concerned about the lack of coordination between the operation of the Trolley and the operation of the buses, they must work as one in the same, scheduling, timing routes, all must work in unison, not independently.

The most important feature is, the Trolley system has failed to meet its ridership goals that it has established many, many years ago, because I know what they were back in the 70s. The Trolley system is also one of the most expensive in the United States and there's reasons for that, and I believe the reason that contributes to it, is a policy that was adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Board in 1974, I was there. Leon Williams made the motion, but I was there in 1974.

The ridership is likely not going to be as high for UTC, because UTC, those people actually own cars as opposed to people in EL Cajon, National City or Chula Vista, more blue-color lower class neighborhoods. UTC on the other hand, is more middle class, upper middle class, they own cars. How are you going to get them out of their cars? You're not. You offer nothing that will
help.

Okay. Those that commute to downtown, but how many commute to downtown? UTC is its own employment center, isn't it? Although, it has a vacancy rate in the commercial property boarding about 25 percent, so some might say it's not employing a lot right now, but do students at UCSD go downtown a lot? No, they don't. I was a student at UCSD. I know a whole bunch of students, none of them go downtown. In fact, what's downtown? I mean, they'll go to UTC, but that's as far as they'll venture out.

The serious question, your potential for total success, and I stress that to meet the goals that were established decades ago, which have not been met yet, and will likely not be met under the current guiding policies, because you need to readdress that policy. You need to get people so they don't have to own a car. If you're going to have to own a car, you're going to use it. How are you going to get people to not own a car? By putting together a system that serves them 24/7 and this system will not do that, because this is pretty pictures on a map, but it doesn't tell you how frequently they're going to run.

The Clairemont Station also, talking to these people, I said, "There isn't --" and he says, "Oh, no,
that's a transit center."

I said, "You mean, you design it so buses come, shuttles come, some other public transit so you can actually get into the residential neighborhoods of Clairemont?"

"Well, buses currently don't run down Morena."

"Well, I know that. But what's the plan? Why bother to have a station at Clairemont? What are you going to do, have people get on?"

Have you ever ridden the Amtrak? But you if go to the stations, they're not going to be designed to work consistently with -- what's the term for buses? Rather, nonfix rail and street level. If it's not going to be designed to work with the buses, why bother? What are you going to do, basically? You know "All right. Here you are, kick them out, you're on your own now," that's going to work well when you consider up Clairemont Drive is one of those oldest and largest senior centers in this town. It's going to really work with the project that's already been approved up Clairemont Drive, where they're going to take out 300 units and put in 600, you know where that is? Right on Clairemont Drive. Right at about this curb right there (indicating.)

This is a great opportunity for ridership, but you see all these people are not going to have any way to
get to the Trolley except to drive.

"Are you going to have parking at these stations?"

He says, "No. No parking. No bus interconnections." Why bother?

But the MTS Board, if they were to get rid of the policy that says, they seem to avoid making the car needless, they don't want to do that. They need to do that. The time has come. We are there now, with the environment, with the statements that came out from the world scientists just yesterday, we are confronted. We need to make changes now. This is not a luxury, this is a necessity. And if MTS doesn't start looking at its own errors, and its error is not -- how many people has it moved? Two percent? Nothing. Nothing! And for me to take this bus on Clairemont Drive to downtown where I used to work, six miles took one hour and 10 minutes. The bus took one hour and ten minutes just for six miles!

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: The first man I met was Mark Thomas, he didn't know what he was talking about, said the map was finalized. I said, "There are stations missing on the map."

He said, "Well, let me check and see." And he said, "Well, this map is finalized, isn't that cute."
And I said, "This is hypothetical?"
"Yes. It's a hypothetical map."
"Well, is it a hypothetical station you have here?" And this is Gilman Drive. "Where's Gilman Drive? Is it written North? South? East or West?"
And he said he didn't know. So, he said, "Well, it doesn't seem to be written on the map. I'll have to check that out."
Well, I went to the other three gentlemen standing there, and they -- I said, "What's this map?"
He says, "Well, this is a duplication of that map." He had some numbers up there saying the average fare for savings on fares, this and that.
I said, "Are they actual numbers, or are they hypothetical numbers? Or are you guys just pushing the pencil around and making it up?"
And he said, "Well, they're approximations."
And I said, "Well, you know, this whole meeting is ridiculous. You expect me to come up here and deal with a hypothetical number, a hypothetical map. You don't know north from southeast from west, and I'm supposed to make a decision based upon all your hypothetical bullshit. And I just can't do it, you know, I can't make a logical decision, based on hypothetical misled pencil-pushing guys that are lying to me. So what
did you have a meeting for? Why'd you bother to call?

So...

And do you want my name? It's Bob Kaul

(Whereupon the Mid-Coast Scoping meeting concluded.)
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ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: John Lucas, 5162 Pacifica Drive, San Diego 92109.

And I just had a couple thoughts. I'll show you a newspaper here. And I know the project is a large amount of money, something over a billion dollars, and I keep reminding myself that every dollar the Government spends today, no matter how it gets out to this project, they have to borrow 43 cents. So I feel that my great-grandchildren will be paying for this project when it's finally paid for.

But I'm one of maybe few in the room that have worked in the Pennsylvania railroads many moons ago and it was the biggest railroad in the Country. It isn't anymore, so I have a lot of experience out in the track and those type of things.

And the suggestion I came up with, we used to have back East, self-propelled cars that would run, and they would haul 100, 150 people, and I'm wondering if we could run cars from Old Town to Gilman Road up here,
self-propelled cars just go back and forth on double track, we wouldn't need new tracks and then just hook up buses and put everyone in the area in a great big circle, it would probably be a lot, lot, lot cheaper. It would probably be in operation in a short amount of time.

And one other comment on another subject. Downtown they have talked about running the Trolley around in a big circle downtown, where you would come in from Old Town, San Ysidro in stops, and then instead of having four cars running around downtown blocking all the intersections, you would have two cars and run them every 10 or 15 minutes, maybe even make it free downtown, like they do in Portland, stops like that. They've had a lot of success.

Now, SANDAG had a big article like that about in the paper or something six months ago, the merchants liked it and they never heard another word.

I thank you so much.

ANONYMOUS SPEAKER: I would oppose Alternative 3, because of my concerns of the environmental, you know, affects. I love Rose Canyon and think that it needs to continue to be protected and kept in its pristine state.

Alternative 6, I understand it would be well, has operational difficulties in terms of the curves and, you know, turns. So it makes sense to me that the
first alternative, the red alternative would be the one that we should pursue.

Thank you. That's it.

(Whereupon the Mid-Coast meeting concluded.)
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Hymie Luden  
Federal Transit Administration  
201 Mission Street, Suite 1650  
San Francisco, California  94105

Subject: Scoping Comments for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Luden:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation, dated April 28, 2010, requesting comments on the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) proposal to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego County, California. Our comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR will build upon and update previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decisions, including the Mid-Coast Corridor Project Draft EIS and the 2001 Final EIS (finalized for the first portion of the locally Preferred Alternative, extending from Old Town Transit Center to Balboa Avenue). EPA previously commented on the Draft EIS in May 1995.

We commend FTA and SANDAG for seeking to improve public transportation service, especially in an area of high traffic congestion and impacted air quality. EPA's scoping comments, as described in the detailed comments, focus on: (1) air quality; (2) integration with existing facilities; (3) green design and construction; (4) impacts to water resources; and (5) impacts to environmental justice communities.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the preparation of the SEIS. When the Draft SEIS is released for public review, please send one hard copy and one disc copy
to the address above (mail code CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-947-4188 or Sturges.Susan@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Susan Sturges, Life Scientist
Environmental Review Office (CED-2)

Enclosure: EPA’s Detailed Comments

CC: Ann Steinberger, San Diego Association of Governments
    Raymond Sukys, Federal Transit Administration
Range of Alternatives

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS) should explore and objectively evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, and briefly discuss the reasons for eliminating some alternatives from further evaluation (40 CFR 1502.14). EPA recommends that the Draft SEIS include a summary of the screening methodology that was used to determine the Range of Alternatives for inclusion in the Draft SEIS. The methodology summary should include information about which criteria and measures were used at each screening level and how they were integrated in a comprehensive evaluation. The Draft SEIS should also include a description of alternatives that were considered but withdrawn with a summary of why they were eliminated.

The Draft SEIS should also identify opportunities for the alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts while fulfilling the project purpose. This may include alignment shifts, buffers, localized design modifications, changes in construction practices, or spanned crossings of sensitive biological resources. As further described below, there is a likely need for a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit for the discharge of fill in waters of the United States (U.S.) for the Project. This will require documentation that a reasonable range of alternatives were analyzed in order to comply with CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Compliance with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines will require that a range of alternatives be evaluated before determining the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA).

Air Quality

The project is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The area is a federally designated Subpart 1 Basic nonattainment area for the 1997 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS), and a maintenance area for the carbon monoxide (CO) NAAQS [40 CFR Part 81]. Because of the area’s nonattainment status, the Draft SEIS should specifically identify measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, including nitrogen oxides (NOx), resulting from the project. It is also important to reduce emissions of mobile source air toxics (MSAT) and particulate matter from this project to the maximum extent.

Recommendations:

- **Ambient Conditions:** The Draft SEIS should include a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions (i.e., baseline or existing conditions), the area’s attainment or nonattainment status for all NAAQS, and potential air quality impacts (including cumulative and indirect impacts) from the construction and operation of the project for each fully evaluated alternative. The Draft SEIS should include estimates of all criteria pollutant emissions and diesel particulate matter (DPM). EPA also recommends that the Draft SEIS disclose the available information about the health risks associated with construction and truck emissions and how the proposed project will affect current emission levels.

- **Relevant Requirements:** The Draft SEIS should describe any applicable local, state, or federal requirements. The Draft SEIS should describe applicable requirements for Federal
Actions that require FTA or Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding or approval and are subject to the Transportation Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A and for Federal Actions that are subject to the General Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart B.

- **Conformity**: The Draft SEIS should ensure that the emissions from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved State Implementation Plan and do not cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS. To meet the transportation conformity requirements, the Draft SEIS should demonstrate that the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and transportation improvement program.

- **Construction**: The responsible agency should include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in the Draft SEIS and adopt this plan in the Record of Decision (ROD). In addition to all applicable local, state, or federal requirements, EPA recommends that the following mitigation measures be included in the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in order to reduce impacts associated with emissions of particulate matter (PM) and other toxics from construction-related activities:

  **Fugitive Dust Source Controls**:
  - Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during weekdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions.
  - Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions.
  - When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph). Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph.

  **Mobile and Stationary Source Controls**:
  - Minimize use, trips, and unnecessary idling of heavy equipment.
  - Maintain and tune engines per manufacturer’s specifications to perform at EPA certification levels, where applicable, and to perform at verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established specifications. The California Air Resources Board has a number of mobile source anti-idling requirements which could be employed. See their website at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm)
  - Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer’s recommendations.
  - If practicable, lease new, clean (diesel or retrofitted diesel) equipment meeting the most stringent of applicable Federal\(^1\) or State Standards\(^2\). In general, commit to the best available emissions control technology. Tier 4 engines should be used for project

---

\(^1\) EPA’s website for nonroad mobile sources is [http://www.epa.gov/nonroad/](http://www.epa.gov/nonroad/).

\(^2\) For ARB emissions standards, see: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/offroad/offroad.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/offroad/offroad.htm).
construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible. Lacking availability of non-road construction equipment that meets Tier 4 engine standards, FTA should commit to using the best available emissions control technologies on all equipment.

- Utilize EPA-registered particulate traps and other appropriate controls where suitable to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.

**Administrative controls:**

- Identify all commitments to reduce construction emissions and update the air quality analysis to reflect additional air quality improvements that would result from adopting specific air quality measures.
- Identify where implementation of mitigation measures is rejected based on economic infeasibility.
- Prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the suitability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking. (Suitability of control devices is based on: whether there is reduced normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime and/or power output, whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engine, or whether there may be a significant risk to nearby workers or the public.) Meet California Air Resources Board (CARB) diesel fuel requirement for off-road and on-highway (i.e., 15 ppm), and where appropriate use alternative fuel sources such as natural gas and electric power.
- Develop a construction traffic and parking management plan that minimizes traffic interference and maintains traffic flow.
- Identify sensitive receptors in the project area, such as children, elderly, and infirm, and specify the means by which you will minimize impacts to these populations. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sustainable Communities Strategies**

The State of California has increased its focus on potential climate change and impacts of increasing greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and Executive Order S-3-05 recognize the impact that climate change can have within California and provide direction for future reductions of greenhouse gases. In fact, the Natural Resources Agency recently adopted Amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions on December 30, 2009, which became effective on March 18, 2010. Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) is aimed at curbing sprawl and reducing vehicle miles traveled in an effort to cut greenhouse gas emissions. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop a “sustainable communities strategy” (SCS), which demonstrates how the region will meet greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets set by CARB.

---

3 Diesel engines < 25 hp rated power started phasing in Tier 4 Model Years in 2008. Larger Tier 4 diesel engines will be phased in depending on the rated power (e.g., 25 hp - <75 hp: 2013; 75 hp - < 175 hp: 2012-2013; 175 hp - < 750 hp: 2011 - 2013; and >= 750 hp: 2011 - 2013).

4 Amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions are available on-line at: http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/.
The State of California is also a 2009 recipient of EPA’s Smart Growth Implementation Assistance (SGIA). The State of California requested assistance in developing a local government sustainable community framework to provide guidance to local jurisdictions in determining which combination of greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies, smart growth practices, and sustainability policies are best for their communities. At the Federal level under the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, EPA, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are working together to help improve access to affordable housing, more transportation options, and lower transportation costs while protecting the environment in communities nationwide. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Department of Transportation will assist EPA in implementing the SGIA for the State of California.

EPA recommends that, as practicable, the Draft SEIS identify the cumulative contributions to greenhouse gas emissions that will result from implementation of the project. In addition, we recommend that the Draft SEIS discuss the potential impacts of climate change on the project and describe how the project meets the intent of statewide and national sustainability initiatives and goals to develop sustainable communities. Finally, the Draft SEIS should identify if there are specific mitigation measures needed to 1) protect the project from the effects of climate change, 2) reduce the project’s adverse air quality effects, and/or 3) promote pollution prevention and environmental stewardship.

Integration with Existing Facilities

The Draft SEIS should explore the extent to which proposed alternatives will integrate with existing transportation facilities. The document should discuss how the project will impact existing vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths due to project construction or operation. All potential alternatives should identify the opportunities available to better connect all modes of transportation, including heavy rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, standard bus service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Measures to minimize or mitigate impacts to vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths should be addressed in the Draft SEIS.

Green Design and Construction

Green Infrastructure
EPA encourages FTA and SANDAG to implement “green infrastructure,” such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips in any onsite stormwater management features. These features can serve as both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements. More detailed information on these forms of “green infrastructure” can be found at http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/home.cfm?program_id=298.

Industrial Materials Reuse and Recycling
For the construction of new infrastructure, EPA recommends industrial materials recycling, or the reusing or recycling of byproduct materials generated from industrial processes. Nonhazardous industrial materials, such as coal ash, foundry sand, construction and demolition materials, slags, and gypsum, are valuable products of industrial processes. Industrial materials recycling preserves natural resources by decreasing the demand for virgin materials, conserves
energy and reduces greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing the demand for products made from energy intensive manufacturing processes; and saves money by decreasing disposal costs for the generator and decreasing materials costs for end users. EPA recommends that, for any new construction proposed, the Draft SEIS identify how industrial materials recycling can be incorporated into project design. More information can be found at: http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conserve/rrr/rrr/index.htm.

Waters of the United States

Given that the project will cross the San Diego River, Tecolote Creek, and Rose Creek, and is in proximity to San Clemente Creek and Mission Bay, this Project may involve the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways. Discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. require authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) under Section 404 of the CWA. The Federal Guidelines at 40 CFR Part 230 promulgated under CWA Section 404 (b)(1) provide substantive environmental criteria that must be met to permit such discharges into waters of the U.S. These criteria require a permitted discharge to: (1) be the LEDPA; (2) avoid causing or contributing to a violation of a State water quality standard; (3) avoid jeopardizing a federally listed species or adversely modifying designated critical habitat for a federally listed species; (4) avoid causing or contributing to significant degradation of the waters of the U.S.; and (5) mitigate for unavoidable impacts to waters. A fully integrated Draft SEIS that adequately addresses these criteria would facilitate the CWA Section 404 permit review process. EPA recommends integrating NEPA and CWA Section 404 requirements in the development of the Draft SEIS.

Waters Assessment

The waters assessment should be of an appropriate scope and detail to identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with functions highly susceptible to change. EPA also recommends the following in the Draft SEIS for the assessment of existing conditions and environmental consequences of each proposed alternative:

- Include the classification of waters and the geographic extent of waters and any adjacent riparian areas.
- Characterize the functional condition of waters and any adjacent riparian areas.
- Include wildlife species affected that could reasonably be expected to use waters or associated riparian habitat and sensitive plant taxa that are associated with waters or associated riparian habitat.
- Analyze the potential flood flow alteration.
- Analyze the potential water quality impact and potential effects to designated uses.
- Address techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

To demonstrate compliance with CWA Guidelines, the Draft SEIS should identify measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. Temporary and
permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. for each alternative studied should be quantified; for example, acres of waters impacted, etc. For each alternative, the Draft SEIS should report these numbers in table form for each impacted water and wetland feature.

The Draft SEIS should also address techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces. The project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and an accompanying Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Where the proposed project will expand or add new impervious surfaces, the current stormwater detention basins and structures may no longer be effective.

Recommendations:

Because the project crosses the San Diego River, Tecolote Creek, and Rose Creek, the water quality analysis in the Draft SEIS should include an estimate of increase in impervious surfaces, estimates of increases in stormwater runoff locations and volume, and locations for specific design features to minimize discharges and dissipate energy. The Draft SEIS should include the following:

- Identify specific locations, on a map, where runoff is expected, along with a map indicating where specific design features for stormwater management will be placed (bioswales, etc.). These options should be presented as a part of the Draft SEIS process and not deferred until a later stage.
- Include storm water performance standards for both construction site sediment control and post-construction project design standards in the Draft SEIS and ROD.
- Provide information regarding the placement, selection, and performance of proposed Best Management Practices (BMPs) in the Draft SEIS.
- Commit to design, install, and maintain BMPs to control total suspended solids (TSS) carried in runoff post-construction of the project.
- Commit to employ BMPs to maintain or reduce the peak runoff discharge rates, to the maximum extent practicable, as compared to the pre-development conditions.

On April 10, 2008, EPA and the Corps issued revised regulations, “Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule” (Mitigation Rule) (40 CFR 230), governing compensatory mitigation for authorized impacts to wetlands, streams, and other waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. These regulations are designed to improve the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation to replace lost aquatic resource functions and area and include a mitigation hierarchy with an inherent preference for mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs before the use of an on-site mitigation site.

Recommendations:

- Include discussion in the Draft SEIS to reflect current regulations. The link to the final Mitigation Rule, which went into effect on June 9, 2008, can be found at [http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WATER/2008/April/Day-10/w6918a.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/EPA-WATER/2008/April/Day-10/w6918a.pdf). Ensure that all mitigation proposed for waters of the U.S. is in compliance with the Mitigation Rule.
• Discuss mitigation for temporary and unavoidable indirect impacts. Temporary impact mitigation should consider additional compensatory mitigation for temporal loss of functions as well as establishing numeric criteria and monitoring of the temporary impact site to ensure that aquatic functions are fully restored. Indirect impacts mitigation should consider opportunities to reduce any potential effects from shading and to compensate for possible wetland habitat fragmentation.

Environmental Justice and Community and User Outreach

The Draft SEIS should identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low income or minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts. Executive Order 12898 addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low income populations, and the Council on Environmental Quality has developed guidance concerning how to address Environmental Justice in the environmental review process (http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ej/justice.pdf). Community involvement activities supporting the project should include opportunities for incorporating public input, especially in Environmental Justice communities, into the facility area design process to promote context sensitive design. In addition, the Draft SEIS should demonstrate compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which, in part, would include analyses for service equity and fare equity.

Recommendations:

• Identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low-income or minority populations and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts. Assessment of the project’s impacts should reflect consultation with affected populations and mitigation measures should be considered where feasible to avoid, mitigate, minimize, rectify, reduce, or eliminate impacts associated with a proposed project (See 40 C.F.R. § 1508.20). Mitigation measures identified in the Draft SEIS should reflect the needs and preferences of the affected low-income and minority populations to the extent practicable.

• Document the process used for community involvement and communication, including all measures to specifically outreach to potential environmental justice communities. Include an analysis of results achieved by reaching out to these populations. EPA has developed a model plan for public participation that may assist FTA in this effort. The Model Plan for Public Participation, EPA OECA, February 2000, is available at: http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/publications/ej/model_public_part_plan.pdf
Mr. Hymie Luden  
Community Planner 
Federal Transit Authority Region 9  
201 Mission Street, Suite 1650  
San Francisco, California 94105  

Subject: Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project San Diego, California.

Dear Mr. Luden:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (MCCT) in San Diego, California. The primary concern and mandate of the Service is the protection of public fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. The Service has legal responsibility for the welfare of migratory birds, anadromous fish, and endangered animals and plants occurring in the United States. The Service is also responsible for administering the Federal Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is serving as lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is serving as lead agency for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The MCCT proposes to improve the existing transit structure within the Mid-Coast corridor to provide alternate transportation opportunities for commuters travelling between San Diego to University City. The Mid-Coast corridor is defined as the area centering on I-5 and extending from downtown San Diego to University City. Several sensitive habitats exist within the project area including coastal sage scrub, wetlands, salt marsh, chaparral and grassland. The project also falls under the City of San Diego (City) Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (SAP).

The comments and recommendations provided herein are based upon information provided in the NOP dated April 28, 2010, the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives dated March 2010, and our knowledge of sensitive and declining vegetation communities in the MSCP and of the...
City’s SAP. To assist us in our review and ensure consistency with the MSCP and the City’s SAP, we request that the SEIS/SEIR address the following and attached information.

The Service is concerned about the potential cumulative impacts from the MCCT and other transportation projects, including the proposed I5 North Coast Widening Project and the California High Speed Rail Project. The SEIS/SEIR should include discussions on other proposed projects within the Mid-Coast Corridor and address any cumulative impacts that may occur.

The Service appreciates the opportunity to comment on the SEIS/SEIR. If you have questions please contact Patrick Gower of my office at (760) 431-9440.

Sincerely,

Karen A. Goebel
Assistant Field Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Leslie Blanda SANDAG
Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

To enable us to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish, and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the SEIS/SEIR:

1. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.

2. A complete list and assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying State or federally listed rare, threatened, endangered, or proposed candidate species, California Species-of-Special Concern and/or State Protected or Fully Protected species, and any locally unique species and sensitive habitats. Specifically, the DEI should include:
   a. A thorough assessment of Rare Natural Communities on site and within the area of impact. We recommend following the California Department of Fish and Game’s Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities.
   b. A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of impact.
   c. An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered species on site and within the area of impact.
   d. Discussions regarding seasonal variations in use by sensitive species of the project site as well as the area of impact on those species, using acceptable species-specific survey procedures as determined through consultation with the Wildlife Agencies. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted in conformance with established protocols at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required.

3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources. All facets of the project should be included in this assessment. Specifically, the DEIR should provide:
   a. Specific acreage and descriptions of the types of wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and other sensitive habitats that will or may be affected by the proposed project or project alternatives. Maps and tables should be used to summarize such information.
b. Discussions regarding the regional setting, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(a), with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region that would be affected by the project. This discussion is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts.

c. Detailed discussions, including both qualitative and quantitative analyses, of the potentially affected listed and sensitive species (fish, wildlife, plants), and their habitats on the proposed project site, area of impact, and alternative sites, including information pertaining to their local status and distribution. The anticipated or real impacts of the project on these species and habitats should be fully addressed.

d. Discussions regarding indirect project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed NCCP reserve lands. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address: project-related changes on drainage patterns on and downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-project fate of runoff from the project site.

e. Discussions regarding possible conflicts resulting from wildlife-human interactions at the interface between the development project and natural habitats. The zoning of areas for development projects or other uses that are nearby or adjacent to natural areas may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions.

f. An analysis of cumulative effects, as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, and past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed concerning their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

g. An analysis of the effect that the project may have on implementation of the MSCP and the City’s SAP. We recommend that the Lead Agency ensure that the development of this and other proposed projects do not preclude long-term preserve planning options and that projects are consistent with the requirements of the MSCP and City SAP.

4. Mitigation measures for unavoidable adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance, and where avoidance is infeasible, reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, offsite mitigation through acquisition and preservation in perpetuity of the affected habitats should
be addressed. We generally do not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts on rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

This discussion should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values where preservation and/or restoration is proposed. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc. Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of the mitigation site; (b) the plant species to be used; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) time of year that planting will occur; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the entity(ies) that will guarantee achieving the success criteria and provide for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.

Mitigation measures to alleviate indirect project impacts on biological resources must be included, including measures to minimize changes in the hydrologic regimes on site, and means to convey runoff without damaging biological resources, including the morphology of on-site and downstream habitats.

5. As discussed previously, descriptions and analyses of a range of alternatives to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. The analyses must include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas of lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.
June 3, 2010

Anne Steinberger
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Notice of Preparation for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Dear Ms. Steinberger,

The above referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) was received in this office on April 30, 2010. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the environmental review process related to the proposed improvements associated with the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. We offer these comments as general direction relative to the policies of the Coastal Act that should be incorporated into the environmental review of any development slated within the corridor that would either directly or indirectly affect the resources of the California Coastal Zone.

The presented goals of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, to improve public transit services between University City, Old Town and downtown San Diego, create an opportunity to enhance San Diego’s established transportation system in a manner that is supportive of many tenets of the Coastal Act. Specifically, Public Resources Code (PRC) 30252 encourages development that facilitates improved public coastal access, and further requires new development to minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles travelled. As the potential environmental effects of the proposed project are further reviewed as a part of the ongoing SEIS/SEIR analysis/review, the following issues should be addressed to assure compliance with the policies of the Coastal Act.

The described project alternatives all include a new bridge crossing across the San Diego River. Except for certain specific instances, fill of a wetland or other coastal waters is prohibited (PRC 30233), and the marine resources (PRC 30230), water quality (PRC 30231) and environmentally sensitive habitat areas (PRC 30240) often associated with the coastal environment are also protected. Proposed project alternatives should be designed to avoid impacts to the river and adjacent wetland and sensitive habitats where possible, and to minimize any unavoidable impacts to the greatest extent feasible.

The alignment of the project alternatives continues in a northward direction along the existing rail corridor within the Coastal Zone, directly east of Mission Bay. In order to protect the scenic and visual resources (PRC 30251) that exist along this corridor, alternatives should be designed at grade to the greatest extent possible. Elevated light rail lines have the potential to block existing public views to the coast that would disrupt the present aesthetic qualities offered from this area.

In order to achieve the stated goal to improve public transit services within the San Diego Region, it will be important to maximize connectivity to existing transit services. One available option to enhance this connectivity would be to create linkages between the northern end of the proposed light-rail improvements and the existing commuter rail services (Coaster, Amtrak) already
available along the LOSSAN corridor. Analysis should be conducted to evaluate the effects that the proposed transit improvements would have on the ridership of these existing passenger rail systems, as well as vehicle trips along the I-5. Another potential option for improved public access to the coast would be the development of a Transit Center at the proposed Balboa Trolley Station that would include a designated shuttle service providing access to the beach communities of La Jolla, Pacific Beach and Mission Beach. Linkages to existing MTS bus routes and service information should also be considered in this effort.

We look forward to future collaboration on improvements to the transportation system of the San Diego region and are available to address any question or concerns you may have.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Buhr
Coastal Program Analyst III
San Diego District
Anne Steinberger  
SANDAG  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101
May 28, 2010

Ms. Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101-4231

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (SCH# 2010051001)

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

The California Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit (MCCT) project, dated April 28, 2010. The following statements and comments have been prepared pursuant to the Department’s authority as Trustee Agency with jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project (California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] Guidelines §5386) and pursuant to our authority as a Responsible Agency under CEQA Guidelines Section 15381 over those aspects of the proposed project that come under the purview of the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code §2050 et seq.) and Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program.

The MCCT project would identify transportation needs and provide transit improvements within a 14-mile corridor centering on Interstate 5 and extending from downtown San Diego on the south to University City on the north. The Mid-Coast corridor is located entirely within the City of San Diego and includes the communities of University City, La Jolla, Clairemont Mesa, Pacific Beach, Mission Beach, Linda Vista, Old Town, Midway, Middletown, Little Italy, and downtown San Diego. The project would improve the Trolley Light Rail Transit (LRT) system and provide access and connections to commercial, office, recreational and educational centers to the aforementioned communities. The Mid-Coast Corridor’s transportation systems would also serve to connect the public with other Trolley lines serving, Mission Valley, South County communities to the international border, and East County communities to Santee.

In the preparation of the draft SEIS/SEIR the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will serve as the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) serving as the CEQA lead agency. The SANDAG Board has approved three LRT Alternatives and the No Build Alternative for consideration during the public scoping process.

The Department offers the following comments and recommendations to assist FTA and SANDAG in avoiding or minimizing potential project impacts on biological resources.

Conserving California’s Wildlife Since 1870
Specific Comments

1. The project is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (and Implementing Agreements under the NCCP program) for the City of San Diego. The NCCP process addresses only those projects that would implement the provisions of the plans through approval by the participating local jurisdictions. The MSCP is intended to provide for the conservation of interconnected habitats that will support the covered species in the long-term. The provisions of the MSCP Subarea Plans were designed to work synergistically toward realization of this goal and must be implemented as designed to achieve this. Although there is some flexibility in the plan, actions clearly contrary to it, may severely limit success to local and regional conservation goals. Because of this, the cooperation of agencies such as the FTA and SANDAG, whom are not covered by the MSCP, would be beneficial. Demonstrating consistency of the proposed project in terms of ensuring that all requirements and conditions of the respective Subarea Plans are met needs to be considered during the environmental review process.

2. The draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives that was included as part of the MCCT project mentions that there will be an evaluation for consistency of the project with the University of California, San Diego (USCD) 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The LRDP for UCSD identifies designated campus natural resources consisting of canyon, steep slopes, native vegetation, and eucalyptus groves as "Park." The LRDP cites that the Park consists of three types of natural reserves that have different constraints to development: Ecological Reserve (which includes the area south of Genesee Avenue, the canyons on the East Campus), Restoration Lands (targeted for restoration or enhancement as mitigation for campus project impacts) and Grove. The draft SEIS/SEIR should analyze/evaluate the alternative route alignments in regards to potential impacts of previously conserved lands under the LRDP and identify the necessary avoidance and minimization measures for these designated areas (including commensurate mitigation for direct habitat and species-related impacts).

3. One of the purposes of CEQA is to “prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible” (CEQA Guideline, §15002 (a)(3); emphasis added). Because of the potential for projects to occur within environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area) the CEQA alternatives analysis for this project is extremely important. The Department is particularly interested in the draft SEIS/SEIR describing a “range of reasonable alternatives to the project (particularly options to minimize grading impacts to preserve lands), or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives,” as required by Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guideline. The alternatives are to include an “alternative [that] would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly” (§15126.6[b] of the CEQA Guidelines). The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making” (§15126.6[f] of the CEQA Guidelines). The Department will consider the alternatives analyzed in the context of their relative impacts on biological resources on both a local and regional level. Furthermore, for the Department to utilize the CEQA document as a Responsible Agency, the alternatives must include those which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources that are regulated by the Fish and Game Code.
4. Take authorization pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and the Federal Endangered Species Act must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in "take" of state and/or federally listed species of plants or animals (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell’s vireo), either during construction or over the life of the project. Permits authorizing take are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore listed threatened or endangered species and their habitats. Early consultation is encouraged with the Department (or when applicable the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), as significant modification to a project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain take authorization. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that the Department issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of a CESA permit unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of CESA. In the event take authorization is required for the proposed project the following items would be required:

a) Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA permit.

b) Department-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.

5. All construction and post-construction best management practices (BMPs) should be located within the development footprint (i.e., included in the impact analysis as loss of habitat). The draft SEIS/SEIR should include a figure depicting the location of BMPs in relation the development footprint.

6. Native plants should be used to the greatest extent feasible in landscaped areas adjacent to and/or near mitigation/open space areas and/or wetland/riparian areas. The applicant should not plant, seed, or otherwise introduce invasive exotic plant species to landscaped areas adjacent and/or near native habitat areas. Exotic plant species not to be used include those species listed on the California Invasive Plant Council’s (Cal-IPC) Invasive Plant Inventory. This list includes such species as: pepper trees, pampas grass, fountain grass, ice plant, myoporum, black locust, capeweed, tree of heaven, periwinkle, sweet alyssum, English ivy, French broom, Scotch broom, and Spanish broom. In addition, landscaping adjacent to native habitat areas should not use plants that require intensive irrigation, fertilizers, or pesticides. Water runoff from landscaped areas should be directed away from mitigation/open space areas and contained and/or treated within the development footprint.

**General Comments**

1. The Department has responsibility for wetland and riparian habitats. It is the policy of the Department to strongly discourage development in wetlands or conversion of wetlands to uplands. We oppose any development or conversion which would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values, unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be "no net loss" of either wetland habitat values or acreage. Development and conversion include but are not limited to conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or

---

1 A copy of the complete list can be obtained by contacting the California Exotic Plant Council at 1442-A Walnut St., #462, Berkeley, California 94709, or by accessing their web site at http://www.cal-ipc.org.
building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. Mitigation measures to compensate for impacts to mature riparian corridors must be included in the draft EIR and must compensate for the loss of function and value of a wildlife corridor.

a. The project area supports aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats; therefore, a jurisdictional delineation of the creeks and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the draft EIR. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the Service’s wetland definition adopted by the Department. Please note that some wetland and riparian habitats subject to the Department’s authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

b. The Department also has regulatory authority with regard to activities occurring in streams and/or lakes that could adversely affect any fish or wildlife resource. For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, the project applicant (or “entity”) must provide written notification to the Department pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, the Department then determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. The Department’s issuance of a LSA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by the Department as a responsible agency. The Department as a responsible agency under CEQA may consider the local jurisdiction’s (lead agency) Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the Department pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA.

2. To enable the Department to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the draft SEIS/SEIR.

a) The document should contain a complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.

b) A range of feasible alternatives should be included to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated; the alternatives should avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas with lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.

---


2 A notification package for a LSA may be obtained by writing to: Department of Fish and Game, 4949 Viewridge Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123, by calling (858) 636-3160, or by accessing the Department’s web site at [www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/1600).
Biological Resources within the Project's Area of Potential Effect

3. The document should provide a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, sensitive, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. This should include a complete floral and faunal species compendium of the entire project site, undertaken at the appropriate time of year. The draft SEIS/SEIR should include the following information.

a) CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(c), direct that knowledge of the regional setting is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, and that special emphasis should be placed on resources that are rare or unique to the region.

b) A thorough assessment of rare plants and rare natural communities, following the Department's Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (Attachment 1, December 1983, revised November 2009).

c) A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of potential effect. The Department's California Natural Diversity Database in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 or www.dfg.ca.gov/biodegdata/cnndb/ to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code.

d) An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect. Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (see CEQA Guidelines, §15380). This should include sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Analyses of the Potential Project-Related Impacts on the Biological Resources

4. The draft SEIS/SEIR should provide a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts.

a) A discussion of impacts associated with increased lighting, noise, human activity, changes in drainage patterns, changes in water volume, velocity, and quality, soil erosion, and/or sedimentation in streams and water courses on or near the project site, with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts should be included.

b) Project impacts should be analyzed relative to their indirect impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands (e.g., preserve lands associated with Multi-Habitat Planning Area under the MSCP Subarea Plan). Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas,
including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address: project-related changes on drainage patterns on and downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-project fate of runoff from the project site. The discussions should also address the proximity of the extraction activities to the water table, whether dewatering would be necessary, and the potential resulting impacts on the habitat, if any, supported by the groundwater.

c) The zoning of areas for development projects or other uses that are nearby or adjacent to natural areas may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the environmental document.

d) A cumulative effects analysis should be developed as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.

Mitigation for the Project-related Biological Impacts

5. The draft SEIS/SEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Rare Natural Communities (Attachment 2) from project-related impacts. The Department considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance.

6. The draft SEIS/SEIR should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, on-site habitat restoration or enhancement should be discussed in detail. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, off-site mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed.

7. For proposed preservation and/or restoration, the draft SEIS/SEIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values from direct and indirect negative impacts. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.

8. In order to avoid impacts to nesting birds, the draft SEIS/SEIR should require that clearing of vegetation, and when biologically warranted construction, occur outside of the peak avian breeding season which generally runs from March 1 through August 31 (as early as January 15 for some raptors). If project construction is necessary during the bird breeding season, a qualified biologist should conduct a survey for nesting birds, within three days prior to the work in the area, and ensure no nesting birds in the project area would be impacted by the project. If an active nest is identified, a buffer shall be established between the construction activities and the nest so that nesting activities are not interrupted. The buffer shall be a minimum width of 300 feet (500 feet for raptors), shall be
delineated by temporary fencing, and shall remain in effect as long as construction is occurring or until the nest is no longer active. No project construction shall occur within the fenced nest zone until the young have fledged, are no longer being fed by the parents, have left the nest, and will no longer be impacted by the project.

9. The Department generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

10. Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of the mitigation site; (b) the plant species to be used, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) planting schedule; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) specific success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the referenced NOP. Questions regarding this letter and further coordination on these issues should be directed to Paul Schlitt at (858) 637-5510.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Edmund P ort
Regional Manager
South Coast Region

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

cc: State Clearinghouse, Sacramento
Paul Schlitt, CDFG, San Diego
Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities

State of California
CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY
Department of Fish and Game
November 24, 2009

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The conservation of special status native plants and their habitats, as well as natural communities, is integral to maintaining biological diversity. The purpose of these protocols is to facilitate a consistent and systematic approach to the survey and assessment of special status native plants and natural communities so that reliable information is produced and the potential of locating a special status plant species or natural community is maximized. They may also help those who prepare and review environmental documents determine when a botanical survey is needed, how field surveys may be conducted, what information to include in a survey report, and what qualifications to consider for surveyors. The protocols may help avoid delays caused when inadequate biological information is provided during the environmental review process; assist lead, trustee and responsible reviewing agencies to make an informed decision regarding the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of a proposed development, activity, or action on special status native plants and natural communities; meet California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements for adequate disclosure of potential impacts; and conserve public trust resources.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TRUSTEE AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY MISSION

The mission of the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is to manage California’s diverse wildlife and native plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public. DFG has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary to maintain biologically sustainable populations (Fish and Game Code §1802). DFG, as trustee agency under CEQA §15386, provides expertise in reviewing and commenting on environmental documents and makes protocols regarding potential negative impacts to those resources held in trust for the people of California.

Certain species are in danger of extinction because their habitats have been severely reduced in acreage, are threatened with destruction or adverse modification, or because of a combination of these and other factors. The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) provides additional protections for such species, including take prohibitions (Fish and Game Code §2050 et seq.). As a responsible agency, DFG has the authority to issue permits for the take of species listed under CESA if the take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity; DFG has determined that the impacts of the take have been minimized and fully mitigated; and, the take would not jeopardize the continued existence of the species (Fish and Game Code §2081). Surveys are one of the preliminary steps to detect a listed or special status plant species or natural community that may be impacted significantly by a project.

DEFINITIONS

Botanical surveys provide information used to determine the potential environmental effects of proposed projects on all special status plants and natural communities as required by law (i.e., CEQA, CESA, and Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)). Some key terms in this document appear in bold font for assistance in use of the document.

For the purposes of this document, special status plants include all plant species that meet one or more of the following criteria:

---

1 This document replaces the DFG document entitled “Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities.”
2 http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/
3 Adapted from the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy available at http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/EACCS/Documents/080228_Species_Evaluation_EACCS.pdf
- Listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under ESA or candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (50 CFR §17.12).

- Listed⁴ or candidates for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under CESA (Fish and Game Code §2050 et seq.). A species, subspecies, or variety of plant is endangered when the prospects of its survival and reproduction in the wild are in immediate jeopardy from one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, over-exploitation, predation, competition, disease, or other factors (Fish and Game Code §2062). A plant is threatened when it is likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future in the absence of special protection and management measures (Fish and Game Code §2067).

- Listed as rare under the California Native Plant Protection Act (Fish and Game Code §1900 et seq.). A plant is rare when, although not presently threatened with extinction, the species, subspecies, or variety is found in such small numbers throughout its range that it may be endangered if its environment worsens (Fish and Game Code §1901).

- Meet the definition of rare or endangered under CEQA §15380(b) and (d). Species that may meet the definition of rare or endangered include the following:
  - Species considered by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) to be “rare, threatened or endangered in California” (Lists 1A, 1B and 2);
  - Species that may warrant consideration on the basis of local significance or recent biological information⁵;
  - Some species included on the California Natural Diversity Database’s (CNNDDB) Special Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List (California Department of Fish and Game 2008)⁶.

- Considered a locally significant species, that is, a species that is not rare from a statewide perspective but is rare or uncommon in a local context such as within a county or region (CEQA §15125 (c)) or is so designated in local or regional plans, policies, or ordinances (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Examples include a species at the outer limits of its known range or a species occurring on an uncommon soil type.

Special status natural communities are communities that are of limited distribution statewide or within a county or region and are often vulnerable to environmental effects of projects. These communities may or may not contain special status species or their habitat. The most current version of the Department’s List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities indicates which natural communities are of special status given the current state of the California classification.

Most types of wetlands and riparian communities are considered special status natural communities due to their limited distribution in California. These natural communities often contain special status plants such as those described above. These protocols may be used in conjunction with protocols formulated by other agencies, for example, those developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to delineate jurisdictional wetlands⁷ or by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to survey for the presence of special status plants⁸.

---

⁴ Refer to current online published lists available at: [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata).

⁵ In general, CNPS List 3 plants (plants about which more information is needed) and List 4 plants (plants of limited distribution) may not warrant consideration under CEQA §15380. These plants may be included on special status plant lists such as those developed by counties where they would be addressed under CEQA §15380. List 3 plants may be analyzed under CEQA §15380 if sufficient information is available to assess potential impacts to such plants. Factors such as regional rarity vs. statewide rarity should be considered in determining whether cumulative impacts to a List 4 plant are significant even if individual project impacts are not. List 3 and 4 plants are also included in the California Natural Diversity Database’s (CNNDDB) Special Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List. [Refer to the current online published list available at: [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata)]. Data on Lists 3 and 4 plants should be submitted to CNNDDB. Such data aids in determining or revising priority ranking.

⁶ Refer to current online published lists available at: [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata).

⁷ [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/camps/pdfs/natcomlist.pdf](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/camps/pdfs/natcomlist.pdf). The rare natural communities are asterisked on this list.

⁸ [http://www.wetlands.com/rege/bios070.htm](http://www.wetlands.com/rege/bios070.htm)

BOTANICAL SURVEYS

Conduct botanical surveys prior to the commencement of any activities that may modify vegetation, such as clearing, mowing, or ground-breaking activities. It is appropriate to conduct a botanical field survey when:

- Natural (or naturalized) vegetation occurs on the site, and it is unknown if special status plant species or natural communities occur on the site, and the project has the potential for direct or indirect effects on vegetation, or
- Special status plants or natural communities have historically been identified on the project site, or
- Special status plants or natural communities occur on sites with similar physical and biological properties as the project site.

SURVEY OBJECTIVES

Conduct field surveys in a manner which maximizes the likelihood of locating special status plant species or special status natural communities that may be present. Surveys should be floristic in nature, meaning that every plant taxon that occurs on site is identified to the taxonomic level necessary to determine rarity and listing status. "Focused surveys" that are limited to habitats known to support special status species or are restricted to lists of likely potential species are not considered floristic in nature and are not adequate to identify all plant taxa on site to the level necessary to determine rarity and listing status. Include a list of plants and natural communities detected on the site for each botanical survey conducted. More than one field visit may be necessary to adequately capture the floristic diversity of a site. An indication of the prevalence (estimated total numbers, percent cover, density, etc.) of the species and communities on the site is also useful to assess the significance of a particular population.

SURVEY PREPARATION

Before field surveys are conducted, compile relevant botanical information in the general project area to provide a regional context for the investigators. Consult the CNDDDB and BIOS for known occurrences of special status plants and natural communities in the project area prior to field surveys. Generally, identify vegetation and habitat types potentially occurring in the project area based on biological and physical properties of the site and surrounding ecoregion, unless a larger assessment area is appropriate. Then, develop a list of special status plants with the potential to occur within these vegetation types. This list can serve as a tool for the investigators and facilitate the use of reference sites; however, special status plants on site might not be limited to those on the list. Field surveys and subsequent reporting should be comprehensive and floristic in nature and not restricted to or focused only on this list. Include in the survey report the list of potential special status species and natural communities, and the list of references used to compile the background botanical information for the site.

SURVEY EXTENT

Surveys should be comprehensive over the entire site, including areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the project. Adjoining properties should also be surveyed where direct or indirect project effects, such as those from fuel modification or herbicide application, could potentially extend offsite. Pre-project surveys restricted to known CNDDDB rare plant locations may not identify all special status plants and communities present and do not provide a sufficient level of information to determine potential impacts.

FIELD SURVEY METHOD

Conduct surveys using systematic field techniques in all habitats of the site to ensure thorough coverage of potential impact areas. The level of effort required per given area and habitat is dependent upon the vegetation and its overall diversity and structural complexity, which determines the distance at which plants can be identified. Conduct surveys by walking over the entire site to ensure thorough coverage, noting all plant taxa.

---

10 Available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb
11 http://www.bios.dfg.ca.gov/
observed. The level of effort should be sufficient to provide comprehensive reporting. For example, one person-hour per eight acres per survey date is needed for a comprehensive field survey in grassland with medium diversity and moderate terrain\textsuperscript{13}, with additional time allocated for species identification.

TIMING AND NUMBER OF VISITS

Conduct surveys in the field at the time of year when species are both evident and identifiable. Usually this is during flowering or fruiting. Space visits throughout the growing season to accurately determine what plants exist on site. Many times this may involve multiple visits to the same site (e.g., in early, mid, and late-season for flowering plants) to capture the floristic diversity at a level necessary to determine if special status plants are present\textsuperscript{14}. The timing and number of visits are determined by geographic location, the natural communities present, and the weather patterns of the year(s) in which the surveys are conducted.

REFERENCE SITES

When special status plants are known to occur in the type(s) of habitat present in the project area, observe reference sites (nearby accessible occurrences of the plants) to determine whether those species are identifiable at the time of the survey and to obtain a visual image of the target species, associated habitat, and associated natural community.

USE OF EXISTING SURVEYS

For some sites, floristic inventories or special status plant surveys may already exist. Additional surveys may be necessary for the following reasons:

- Surveys are not current\textsuperscript{15}, or
- Surveys were conducted in natural systems that commonly experience year to year fluctuations such as periods of drought or flooding (e.g., vernal pool habitats or riverine systems); or
- Surveys are not comprehensive in nature; or fire history, land use, physical conditions of the site, or climatic conditions have changed since the last survey was conducted\textsuperscript{16}, or
- Surveys were conducted in natural systems where special status plants may not be observed if an annual above ground phase is not visible (e.g., flowers from a bulb); or
- Changes in vegetation or species distribution may have occurred since the last survey was conducted, due to habitat alteration, fluctuations in species abundance and/or seed bank dynamics.

NEGATIVE SURVEYS

Adverse conditions may prevent investigators from determining the presence of, or accurately identifying, some species in potential habitat of target species. Disease, drought, predation, or herbivory may preclude the presence or identification of target species in any given year. Discuss such conditions in the report.

The failure to locate a known special status plant occurrence during one field season does not constitute evidence that this plant occurrence no longer exists at this location, particularly if adverse conditions are present. For example, surveys over a number of years may be necessary if the species is an annual plant having a persistent, long-lived seed bank and is known not to germinate every year. Visits to the site in more

\textsuperscript{13} Adapted from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service kit fox survey guidelines available at www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/documents/kitfox_no_protocol.pdf


\textsuperscript{15} Habitats, such as grasslands or desert plant communities that have annual and short-lived perennial plants as major floristic components may require yearly surveys to accurately document baseline conditions for purposes of impact assessment. In forested areas, however, surveys at intervals of five years may adequately represent current conditions. For forested areas, refer to "Guidelines for Conservation of Sensitive Plant Resources Within the Timber Harvest Review Process and During Timber Harvesting Operations", available at https://l1.dfg.ca.gov/portal/Portals/1/THPBotanicalGuidelinesJuly2005.pdf

than one year increase the likelihood of detection of a special status plant especially if conditions change. To further substantiate negative findings for a known occurrence, a visit to a nearby reference site may ensure that the timing of the survey was appropriate.

REPORTING AND DATA COLLECTION

Adequate information about special status plants and natural communities present in a project area will enable reviewing agencies and the public to effectively assess potential impacts to special status plants or natural communities and will guide the development of minimization and mitigation measures. The next section describes necessary information to assess impacts. For comprehensive, systematic surveys where no special status species or natural communities were found, reporting and data collection responsibilities for investigators remain as described below, excluding specific occurrence information.

SPECIAL STATUS PLANT OR NATURAL COMMUNITY OBSERVATIONS

Record the following information for locations of each special status plant or natural community detected during a field survey of a project site:

- A detailed map (1:24,000 or larger) showing locations and boundaries of each special status species occurrence or natural community found as related to the proposed project. Mark occurrences and boundaries as accurately as possible. Locations documented by use of global positioning system (GPS) coordinates must include the datum in which they were collected;
- The site-specific characteristics of occurrences, such as associated species, habitat and microhabitat, structure of vegetation, topographic features, soil type, texture, and soil parent material. If the species is associated with a wetland, provide a description of the direction of flow and integrity of surface or subsurface hydrology and adjacent off-site hydrological influences as appropriate;
- The number of individuals in each special status plant population as counted (if population is small) or estimated (if population is large);
- If applicable, information about the percentage of individuals in each life stage such as seedlings vs. reproductive individuals;
- The number of individuals of the species per unit area, identifying areas of relatively high, medium and low density of the species over the project site; and
- Digital images of the target species and representative habitats to support information and descriptions.

FIELD SURVEY FORMS

When a special status plant or natural community is located, complete and submit to the CNDDB a California Native Species (or Community) Field Survey Form or equivalent written report, accompanied by a copy of the relevant portion of a 7.5 minute topographic map with the occurrence mapped. Present locations documented by use of GPS coordinates in map and digital form. Data submitted in digital form must include the datum in which it was collected. If a potentially undescribed special status natural community is found on the site, document it with a Rapid Assessment or Relevé form and submit it with the CNDDB form.

VOUCHER COLLECTION

Voucher specimens provide verifiable documentation of species presence and identification as well as a public record of conditions. This information is vital to all conservation efforts. Collection of voucher specimens should

---

18 NAD83, NAD27 or WGS84
19 [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata)
20 NAD83, NAD27 or WGS84
be conducted in a manner that is consistent with conservation ethics, and is in accordance with applicable state and federal permit requirements (e.g. incidental take permit, scientific collection permit). Voucher collections of special status species (or suspected special status species) should be made only when such actions would not jeopardize the continued existence of the population or species.

Deposit voucher specimens with an indexed regional herbarium22 no later than 60 days after the collections have been made. Digital imagery can be used to supplement plant identification and document habitat. Record all relevant permittee names and permit numbers on specimen labels. A collecting permit is required prior to the collection of State-listed plant species23.

BOTANICAL SURVEY REPORTS

Include reports of botanical field surveys containing the following information with project environmental documents:

- Project and site description
  - A description of the proposed project;
  - A detailed map of the project location and study area that identifies topographic and landscape features and includes a north arrow and bar scale; and,
  - A written description of the biological setting, including vegetation24 and structure of the vegetation; geological and hydrological characteristics; and land use or management history.

- Detailed description of survey methodology and results
  - Dates of field surveys (indicating which areas were surveyed on which dates), name of field investigator(s), and total person-hours spent on field surveys;
  - A discussion of how the timing of the surveys affects the comprehensiveness of the survey;
  - A list of potential special status species or natural communities;
  - A description of the area surveyed relative to the project area;
  - References cited, persons contacted, and herbaria visited;
  - Description of reference site(s), if visited, and phenological development of special status plant(s);
  - A list of all taxa occurring on the project site. Identify plants to the taxonomic level necessary to determine whether or not they are a special status species;
  - Any use of existing surveys and a discussion of applicability to this project;
  - A discussion of the potential for a false negative survey;
  - Provide detailed data and maps for all special plants detected. Information specified above under the headings "Special Status Plant or Natural Community Observations," and "Field Survey Forms," should be provided for locations of each special status plant detected;
  - Copies of all California Native Species Field Survey Forms or Natural Community Field Survey Forms should be sent to the CNDDDB and included in the environmental document as an Appendix. It is not necessary to submit entire environmental documents to the CNDDDB; and,
  - The location of voucher specimens, if collected.

---


23 Refer to current online published lists available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata

24 A vegetation map that uses the National Vegetation Classification System (http://biology.usgs.gov/npveg/nvcs.html), for example A Manual of California Vegetation, and highlights any special status natural communities. If another vegetation classification system is used, the report should reference the system, provide the reason for its use, and provide a crosswalk to the National Vegetation Classification System.
• Assessment of potential impacts
  • A discussion of the significance of special status plant populations in the project area considering nearby populations and total species distribution;
  • A discussion of the significance of special status natural communities in the project area considering nearby occurrences and natural community distribution;
  • A discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to the plants and natural communities;
  • A discussion of threats, including those from invasive species, to the plants and natural communities;
  • A discussion of the degree of impact, if any, of the proposed project on unoccupied, potential habitat of the species;
  • A discussion of the immediacy of potential impacts; and,
  • Recommended measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts.

QUALIFICATIONS
Botanical consultants should possess the following qualifications:
• Knowledge of plant taxonomy and natural community ecology;
• Familiarity with the plants of the area, including special status species;
• Familiarity with natural communities of the area, including special status natural communities;
• Experience conducting floristic field surveys or experience with floristic surveys conducted under the direction of an experienced surveyor;
• Familiarity with the appropriate state and federal statutes related to plants and plant collecting; and,
• Experience with analyzing impacts of development on native plant species and natural communities.

SUGGESTED REFERENCES
California Natural Diversity Database. Most recent version. Special vascular plants, bryophytes and lichens list. Updated quarterly. Available at www.dfg.ca.gov.
Sensitivity of Top Priority Rare Natural Communities in Southern California

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

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

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

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

Sensitivity Rankings (February 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Community Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S1.1 | Mojave Riparian Forest  
Sonoran Cottonwood Willow Riparian  
Mesquite Bosque  
Elephant Tree Woodland  
Crucifixion Thorn Woodland  
Allthorn Woodland  
Arizonan Woodland  
Southern California Walnut Forest  
Mainland Cherry Forest  
Southern Bishop Pine Forest  
Torrey Pine Forest  
Desert Mountain White Fir Forest  
Southern Dune Scrub  
Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub  
Maritime Succulent Scrub  
Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub  
Southern Maritime Chaparral  
Valley Needlegrass Grassland  
Great Basin Grassland  
Mojave Desert Grassland  
Pebble Plains  
Southern Sedge Bog  
Cismontane Alkali Marsh |
S1.2 Southern Foredunes
Mono Pumice Flat
Southern Interior Basalt Flow Vernal Pool

S2.1 Venturan Coastal Sage Scrub
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub
Riversidean Upland Coastal Sage Scrub
Riversidean Desert Sage Scrub
Sagebrush Steppe
Desert Sink Scrub
Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral
San Diego Mesa Hardpan Vernal Pool
San Diego Mesa Claypan Vernal Pool
Alkali Meadow
Southern Coastal Salt Marsh
Coastal Brackish Marsh
Transmontane Alkali Marsh
Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh
Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest
Southern Willow Scrub
Modoc-Great Basin Cottonwood Willow Riparian
Modoc-Great Basin Riparian Scrub
Mojave Desert Wash Scrub
Engelmann Oak Woodland
Open Engelmann Oak Woodland
Closed Engelmann Oak Woodland
Island Oak Woodland
California Walnut Woodland
Island Ironwood Forest
Island Cherry Forest
Southern Interior Cypress Forest
Bigcone Spruce-Canyon Oak Forest

S2.2 Active Coastal Dunes
Active Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Dunes
Stabilized and Partially Stabilized Desert Sandfield
Mojave Mixed Steppe
Transmontane Freshwater Marsh
Coulter Pine Forest
Southern California Fellfield
White Mountains Fellfield

S2.3 Bristlecone Pine Forest
Limber Pine Forest
May 28, 2010

Ms. Anne Steinberger  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, California 92101

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT (NOP) FOR MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT (SCH# 2010051001)

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted Notice of Preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the above-mentioned project. The following project description is stated in your document: “Transit improvements within the Mid-Coast Corridor generally defined as the area centering on Interstate 5 and extending from Downtown San Diego on the south to University City on the north”.

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has the following comments:

1) The EIR should evaluate whether conditions within the project area may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:

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

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

   • Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
- Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.

- Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.

- GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

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

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

2) The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If necessary, DTSC would require an oversight agreement in order to review such documents.

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

4) If buildings, other structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are being planned to be demolished, an investigation should also be conducted for the presence of other hazardous chemicals, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If other hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints (LPB) or products, mercury or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.
5) Future project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. Sampling may be required. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed and not simply placed in another location onsite. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to such soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, sampling should be conducted to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination.

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

7) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should also obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942. Certain hazardous waste treatment processes or hazardous materials, handling, storage or uses may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.

8) DTSC can provide cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies that are not responsible parties, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA or VCA, please see www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields, or contact Ms. Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi, DTSC’s Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489.
If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at ashami@dtsc.ca.gov, or by phone at (714) 484-5472.

Sincerely,

Al Shami
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
    State Clearinghouse
    P.O. Box 3044
    Sacramento, California 95812-3044
    state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

    CEQA Tracking Center
    Department of Toxic Substances Control
    Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
    P.O. Box 806
    Sacramento, California 95812
    ADelacr1@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA # 2905
Ms. Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101
June 1, 2010

Ms. Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (SCH 2010051001) to be located in and around Interstate 5 (I-5) from Interstate 8 (I-8) to University of California, San Diego (UCSD). Caltrans has the following comments:

Caltrans supports the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The proposed light rail transit extension from Old Town to University City will provide new travel options and improve mobility within the congested I-5 corridor.

Caltrans has worked successfully with the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, North County Transit District and SANDAG to accommodate and permit portions of other regional light rail transit projects within or crossing the Caltrans right-of-way (R/W) while maintaining the R/W needed for future highway improvements. Such projects include the recently completed Trolley Green Line extension to San Diego State University and the SPRINTER. The experience gained from these past successes can be utilized in the coordination and permitting efforts necessary for the planning, design and construction of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

Based on the coordination that has occurred over the years between Caltrans and SANDAG, Caltrans has no major concerns with locating the proposed Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project within the Caltrans R/W as planned. Continued cooperation as the details of the I-5 proposed highway improvement projects and the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project are defined is anticipated to allow for the successful completion both projects thus improving transportation capacity and options in the I-5 corridor.

Any work performed within R/W requires discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and must be clearly identified and included in the environmental document. The identification of avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be a condition of the Caltrans encroachment permit approval as well as the procurement of any necessary regulatory and resource agency permits.

Improvement plans for construction within the State Highway R/W must include the appropriate engineering information consistent with the State code, and signed and stamped by a professional
engineer registered in the State of California. The Caltrans Permit Manual contains a listing of
typical information required for project plans. All design and construction must be in
conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) activities.

Caltrans looks forward to continuing our coordination efforts with SANDAG staff on the Mid-
Coast Corridor Transit Project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please
contact Trent Clark at (619) 688-3140.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JACOB M. ARMSTRONG, Branch Chief
Development Review Branch

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
May 5, 2010

Ms. Anne Steinberger, Project Director
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
401 "B" Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: SCH#2010051001 CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project located in the mid-coast, west-central San Diego County, California

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is the state 'trustee agency' pursuant to Public Resources Code §21070 for the protection and preservation of California’s Native American Cultural Resources. (Also see Environmental Protection Information Center v. Johnson (1985) 170 Cal App. 3d 604). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA - CA Public Resources Code §21000-21177, amended in 2009) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c)(f) CEQA guidelines). Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance." In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following.

The Native American Heritage Commission did perform a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search in the NAHC SLF Inventory, established by the Legislature pursuant to Public Resources Code §5097.94(a) and Native American Cultural resources were identified within the APE, the Old Town, Pacific Beach, La Jolla areas. Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Enclosed are the names of the nearest tribes and interested Native American individuals that the NAHC recommends as 'consulting parties,' for this purpose, that may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We recommend that you contact persons on the attached list of Native American contacts. A Native American Tribe or Tribal Elder may be the only source of information about a cultural resource. Also, the NAHC recommends that a Native American Monitor or Native American culturally knowledgeable person be employed whenever a professional archaeologist is employed during the 'Initial Study' and in other phases of the environmental planning processes. Furthermore we suggest that you contact the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Coordinator's office (at (916) 653-7278, for referral to the nearest OHP Information Center of which there are 11.
Consultation with tribes and interested Native American tribes and interested Native American individuals, as consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321-43351) and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 [f]) et seq., 36 CFR Part 800.3, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ; 42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013), as appropriate. The 1992 Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes.

Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in Section 15370 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when significant cultural resources could be affected by a project. Also, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a dedicated cemetery. Discussion of these should be included in your environmental documents, as appropriate.

The authority for the SLF record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory, established by the California Legislature, is California Public Resources Code §5097.94(a) and is exempt from the CA Public Records Act (c.f. California Government Code §6254.10). The results of the SLF search are confidential. However, Native Americans on the attached contact list are not prohibited from and may wish to reveal the nature of identified cultural resources/historic properties. Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C. 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APE and possibly threatened by proposed project activity.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens. Although tribal consultation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; CA Public Resources Code Section 21000 – 21177) is ‘advisory’ rather than mandated, the NAHC does request ‘lead agencies’ to work with tribes and interested Native American individuals as ‘consulting parties,’ on the list provided by the NAHC in order that cultural resources will be protected. However, the 2006 SB 1059 the state enabling legislation to the Federal Energy Policy Act of 2005, does mandate tribal consultation for the electric transmission corridors. This is codified in the California Public Resources Code, Chapter 4.3, and §25330 to Division 15, requires consultation with California Native American tribes, and identifies both federally recognized and non-federally recognized on a list maintained by the NAHC.

Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or
medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

Again, Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Edwin Romero, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road  Diegueno
Lakeside, CA 92040
sue@barona-nsn.gov
(619) 443-6612
619-443-0681

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

Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office
Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road  Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 91901
wmicklin@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

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

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

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

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
PO Box 385  Diegueno
Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-3200
(760) 749-3876 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road  Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 92001
(619) 445-0385
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Jamul Indian Village
Kenneth Meza, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612
Jamul, CA 91935
jamulrez@sctdv.net
(619) 669-4785
(619) 669-48178 - Fax

Inaja Band of Mission Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Spokesperson
2005 S. Escondido Blvd.
Escondido, CA 92025
(760) 737-7628
(760) 747-8568 Fax

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

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 742-5587
(619) 443-0681 FAX

Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation
Paul Cuero
36190 Church Road, Suite 5
Campo, CA 91906
chairman@campo-nsn.gov
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-9505
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Ewiiapaayp Tribal Office
Will Micklin, Executive Director
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA 91901
wmicklin@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

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

Ewiiapaayp Tribal Office
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA 91901
michaelg@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax
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Clint Linton
P.O. Box 507
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 803-5694
cjlinton73@aol.com

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Monique LaChappa, Chairwoman
36190 Church Road
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-9046

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy
M. Louis Guassac, Executive Director
P.O. Box 1992
Alpine, CA 91903
(619) 852-8430
guassacl@onebox.com

Diegueno/Kumeyaay
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June 1, 2010

Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: SCH#2010051001: Comments to Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has regulatory and safety oversight over railroad crossings in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission with exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings. Rail Crossing Engineering Section (RCES) staff is in receipt of the San Diego Association of Governments Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and has reviewed the document for impacts to rail crossing safety.

The proposed project would provide for transit improvements within the Mid-Coast Corridor, defined as the area centering on Interstate 5 and extending from downtown San Diego on the south to University City on the north. The corridor is bound by the Pacific Ocean on the west and Interstate 805 and State Route 163 on the east.

The purpose of the proposed project is to implement a transit project that addresses the identified transportation needs for the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project would improve public transit services between University City, Old Town, and downtown San Diego and would connect corridor residents with other Trolley lines, thereby enhancing direct public access to other regional activity centers. The project would improve travel options to employment, education, medical, and retail centers for corridor residents, commuters, and visitors.

In the development of the environmental document, SANDAG should analyze impacts to highway-rail crossings. Commission approval is required for the construction of any new crossing. SANDAG should consider grade separations for major thoroughfares and study pedestrian and vehicle traffic at the crossings. During the process, SANDAG should be in contact with staff to discuss any relevant concerns or issues.

If you have any questions, you may contact me at (213) 576-7076 or ldi@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Laurence Michael, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
May 24, 2010

Ms. Anne Steinberger
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA, 92101

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) FOR THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SEIS/SEIR), SCH# 2010051001

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on San Diego Association of Government's (SANDAG's) Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (project). The proposed project will implement light rail public transit improvements within the Mid-Coast Corridor, located within the City of San Diego, including the communities (either in entirety or in portions of): downtown San Diego, Uptown, Old Town, Mission Beach, Pacific Beach, Linda Vista, Clairemont Mesa, La Jolla, and University City. The alternatives under consideration include a no-build alternative, and several Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternatives, including:

- I-5/Voigt Drive/Genesee Avenue Alternative (LRT Alternative 1);
- Genesee Avenue Tunnel Alternative (LRT Alternative 2); and
- I-5/Thornton Hospital Alternative (LRT Alternative 6).

Our comments are submitted in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15096, which requires CEQA responsible agencies to specify the scope and content of the environmental information germane to their statutory responsibilities and lead agencies to include that information in their Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The State Water Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) regulate discharges to protect the quality of water of the State, broadly defined as "the chemical, physical, biological, bacteriological, radiological, and other properties and characteristics of water which affects its use." If the proposed project

---

1 California Water Code, section 13050.
has any of the following discharges, the project proponent is required to obtain a permit from the State or Regional Water Boards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Type</th>
<th>Types of Permits involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of dredge and fill materials</td>
<td>- Clean Water Act (CWA) section 401 water quality certification for federal waters; or Waste Discharge Requirements for non-federal waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater discharges</td>
<td>- CWA section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit (e.g., storm water permit), new construction general permit (new CGP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other discharges</td>
<td>- Waste Discharge Requirements or other permits for discharges that may affect groundwater quality and other waters of the State, such as operation of proposed solid waste transfer facilities, and other proposed project activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early consultation is encouraged, as project reconfiguration may be required to avoid and minimize impacts to State waters.

**Effects of Urban Development on Water Quality**

Watersheds are complex natural systems in which physical, chemical, and biologic components interact to create the beneficial uses of water on which our economy and well-being depend. Poorly planned urban transportation upsets these natural interactions and degrades water quality through a web of interrelated effects. The primary impacts of poorly planned transit projects on water quality are:

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

These impacts typically degrade water quality, increase peak flows and flooding, and destabilize stream channels; resulting in engineered solutions to the disrupted flow patterns and, ultimately, near-total loss of natural functions and values in the affected basins. Many examples of such degradation exist in California and elsewhere.
The Water Boards are mandated to prevent such degradation. CEQA establishes the process to provide the information we need to do so. Specific technical comments indicating the information and analyses germane to our statutory responsibilities are provided in the following attachments to this letter:

- Attachment 1, *Urban Development: Potential Water Quality Impacts and Required Analyses.* Outlines and diagrams the potential effects of land development on water quality and identifies related information needs.

- Attachment 2, *Low Impact Development References.* Lists documents providing guidance on principles and practices to avoid water quality and quantity problems associated with urban development.

- Attachment 3, *Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources.* Provides information and references on the importance of stream corridors, wetlands, and other waters in maintaining local and regional habitat connectivity.

More general, summary advice regarding the needed information follows.

**Scope and Level of Needed Analyses**

The SEIS/SEIR for this project should characterize all project-specific cumulative, direct, and indirect impacts to the quality of waters of the state as defined above, and identify alternatives and other mitigation measures to reduce and eliminate such impacts. Analyses should include:

1. **Avoidance and Minimization Analysis**

   The project has the potential to degrade water quality in many ways. Fortunately, avoiding or minimizing any step in a pollution pathway will eliminate or reduce subsequent effects, and will simplify the associated needed analyses. Furthermore, a small number of key variables control most of the pathways causing water quality degradation. We strongly encourage avoidance as the primary strategy to address water quality concerns.

   Please include in the SEIS/SEIR:

   a. Measures to avoid or minimize each potential cause of water quality degradation as described in Attachments 1 and 3 to these comments.

   For example, the project should identify proposed Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented within railway right-of-ways, park and ride lots, transit stations, and support building areas. SanDag’s “Lesson’s Learned from Peer Regions” prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff (December 2009) identifies Portland as a benchmark transit city. The parking areas within Portland’s Max Light Rail support building areas incorporate LID BMPs, and have pavement that lets water drain through it, which reduces runoff. Portland’s Max Yellow Line at Delta Park/Vanport...
Station utilizes bioswales for stormwater filtration to treat stormwater from the street, tracks and light rail operations; and these bioswales incorporate planting strips where exotic invasive plants have been removed and these areas replanted with native plants appropriate for the area. SanDieg's Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project should utilize the "lessons learned" about LID BMPs from Portland's light rail network.

b. An analysis of why any remaining impacts cannot be avoided or further minimized.

2. Alternatives Analysis

Because development projects can individually and cumulatively cause major water quality impacts, we strongly encourage a low-impact planning approach.

Please:

a. Include in the alternatives presented in the SEIS/SEIR a low-impact approach for future authorized projects, based on principles and practices described in the documents listed in Attachment 2 to these comments, Low Impact Development References.

b. Such an approach generally involves more compact development that:
   - Minimizes generation of urban pollutants;
   - Preserves the amenity and other values of natural waters;
   - Maintains natural waters, drainage paths, landscape features and other water-holding areas to promote stormwater retention, pollution removal, and groundwater recharge;
   - Designs communities and landscaping to minimize stormwater generation, runoff, and concentration; promote groundwater recharge; and reduce water demand; and
   - Promotes water conservation and re-use.

3. Identification of Affected Waters

A clear understanding of the location and nature of the waters potentially affected by this project is fundamental to fulfillment of our regulatory responsibilities.

Please:

a. Provide regional-scale and 1:24,000-scale maps and a description of all waters potentially affected by the proposed project, tabulated and organized by watershed (drainage basin) and waterbody type, e.g., wetlands, riparian
areas (as defined by the National Academy of Sciences), streams, other surface waters, and groundwater basins (a greater level of discrimination is usually appropriate, e.g. of wetland type).

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

c. Identify any “isolated” wetlands or other waters excluded from federal jurisdiction by court decisions.

4. Characterization of Impacts

As noted above, we believe avoidance is the best strategy for managing potential water quality impacts. For unavoidable impacts, understanding how pollution pathways will operate is essential to managing them.

Please:

a. Specify the causes, natures, and magnitude of all proposed impacts. Provide a level of analyses commensurate with the size and complexity of the project and its potential water quality impacts, referring to Attachments 1 and 3 to these comments.

b. Quantify impacts as definitively as feasible, using appropriate modeling and adequate data. Modeling approaches should be documented; and data deficiencies or other factors affecting the reliability of the results identified and characterized.

c. Identify whether impacts will be temporary or permanent.

5. Hydrologic Disruption Analysis

Because increased runoff from developed areas is the key variable driving a number of other adverse effects, attention to maintaining the pre-development hydrograph will prevent or minimize many problems and will limit the need for other analyses and mitigation in the SEIS/SEIR.

---

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

4 e.g., U.S. Supreme Court, Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2001.
Please:

a. Include in the alternatives and mitigations analyses measures to maintain the pre-project hydrograph.

b. Provide a meaningful analysis of potential cumulative impacts to watershed hydrology from existing and planned development in the watershed or planning area.

6. Habitat Connectivity Analysis

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

Please:

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

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

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

d. To inform these analyses, consider the information and literature referenced in Attachment 3, *Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related To Wetland, Riparian, and Other Aquatic Resources*, including recent data on the role of riparian corridors as movement corridors in California.

Again, thank you for this chance to comment. We welcome the opportunity to work with you to make the project an example of environmental sustainability in California. If we may clarify any of our comments or be of further assistance, please contact Linda Pardy at 858 627-3932 or LPardy@waterboards.ca.gov.

Respectfully,

CHIARA M. CLEMENTE  
Senior Environmental Scientist

Attachments
Ms. Anne Steinberger
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project - NOP

cc: Mr. Ed Pert, Regional Manager
    Department of Fish and Game
    4949 Viewridge Avenue
    San Diego, CA 92123

    Mr. Mark Durham, Chief
    Regulatory Section
    U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
    San Diego Field Office
    6010 Hidden Valley Road, Suite 105,
    Carlsbad CA 92011

    Tim Vendlinski, Chief (WTR-8)
    Wetlands Regulatory Office
    U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
    75 Hawthorne Street
    San Francisco, CA 94105

    State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit
    Governor's Office of Planning and Research
    1400 10th Street
    P.O. Box 3044
    Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
Urban Transportation Development:
Potential Water Quality Impacts and Required Analyses

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The table and diagram are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FILL &amp; EXCAVATION Fill or excavation in wetlands, riparian areas, or other waters of the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Decreased Flood Storage. [4] Fill can impinge on the natural storage volume of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial channels, backwaters, and wetlands, reducing capacity to retain runoff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10] Fill and excavation can decrease groundwater recharge and cause lower water tables by changing soil percolation characteristics and reducing the area of standing water in recharge basins. Linear excavation (e.g., for utility lines) can act as a conduit to drain groundwater and locally lower water tables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17] Fill and excavation can bury or remove vegetation and can change site features to prevent reestablishment of characteristic species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1) Quantify reduced flood storage in each affected basin.  
2) Identify mitigation. |
| 1) Quantify groundwater response to changes in percolation.  
2) Identify locations where linear alignments could act to dewater shallow aquifers.  
3) Identify mitigation. |
| 1) Identify and map types and areal extents of affected vegetation.  
2) Identify mitigation. |
### Potential Effects of Urban Transportation Development on BUs and RQD Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]  
Fill can directly impair beneficial uses by reducing water area and changing hydrology, geomorphology, substrate, and other waterbody characteristics. In addition, projects which fragment habitat and reduce wildlife movement along riparian and other corridors can degrade remaining patches of wetlands and other habitat by changing their physical characteristics and by isolating and exposing small populations of plants and animals, resulting in local or regional extinctions.³ | 1) Document types, areal extents, and (for drainage features) lengths of affected waters.  
2) Characterize and map at project-area and regional scales existing wildlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity.  
3) Identify effects of fill on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity (refer to Enclosure 3).  
4) Identify watershed-level effects on pollutant removal and flood retention.  
5) Identify mitigation. | |
| 2A. CONSTRUCTION  
Clearing, grading, and construction of structures and facilities. | A. Production of Urban Pollutants. [7]  
Construction can produce pollutants through improper use and disposal of toxic construction materials. | 1) Identify mitigation for inclusion in stormwater pollution prevention plan. |
| B. Change in Soil Erosion. [8]  
Active construction can dramatically increase soil erosion by exposing and destabilizing soils. Erosion is compounded by the increased runoff typically accompanying construction.⁶ | 1) Identify location and extent of planned grading.  
Display proximity and slope relationships to receiving drainages.  
2) Document erodibility of soils and subsoils in areas proposed for grading.  
3) Quantify amount and duration of increased sediment loadings to each affected drainage.  
4) Identify mitigation. |
| C. Increased Runoff. [9]  
Construction can increase both the total and peak volume of stormwater runoff by removing vegetation, compacting soil, exposing dense subsoil, creating steep graded slopes, and eliminating terrain depressions and ephemeral and intermittent drainages that would naturally slow the movement of stormwater.⁹ | 1) Quantify total and peak volumes of increased runoff for each affected drainage.  
2) Identify mitigation. |
| D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]  
Projects which fragment habitat and reduce wildlife movement along riparian and other corridors can degrade remaining patches of wetlands and other habitat by changing their physical characteristics and by isolating and exposing small populations of plants and animals, resulting in local or regional extinctions.¹¹ | 1) Characterize and map at project-area and regional scales existing wildlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity.  
2) Identify effects of construction on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity (refer to Enclosure 3).  
3) Identify mitigation. |
| 2B. POST-CONSTRUCTION  
Ongoing effects of constructed environment | A. Dry weather discharge. [6]  
Construction can cause dry-season “nuisance” runoff from activities such as landscape irrigation⁵, sidewalk and vehicle washing, and basement dewatering | 1) Characterize volumes, seasonality, and other pertinent characteristics of “nuisance” flows for each affected drainage. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Increased Groundwater Pumping. [5]</td>
<td>Construction can cause increased groundwater pumping for domestic or landscape use.⁶</td>
<td>1) Quantify and map locations of increased pumping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Production of Urban Pollutants. [7]</td>
<td>After construction, urban areas can generate pesticides, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, bacteria, viruses, and other pollutants from activities such as landscape care and vehicle operation and maintenance.⁷</td>
<td>1) Quantify projected increase in pollution production in each affected basin 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Change in Soil Erosion. [8]</td>
<td>After construction, erosion can be reduced to below natural levels because soils are covered with buildings and pavement, and runoff is routed through storm drains.⁹</td>
<td>1) Quantify reduction of natural sediment delivery rates to each affected basin 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Increased Runoff. [9]</td>
<td>After construction, maintained landscapes and impervious surfaces such as roofs and streets increase total and peak runoff. The increased flows move quickly over paved surfaces and are collected, concentrated, and further accelerated in storm drain systems. The combination of increased flows and more efficient transport causes a higher, &quot;flashy&quot;, more rapidly peaking and falling hydrograph, especially for smaller, more frequent floods.¹⁰</td>
<td>1) Quantify project-induced changes in total and peak runoff rates to each affected drainage 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CHANNELIZATION
Engineered changes in channel structure or morphology to stabilize banks, prevent flooding, or increase flow conveyance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Decreased Flood Storage. [4]</th>
<th>1) Quantify and map reductions in flood storage in each affected basin 2) Identify mitigation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channelization can reduce flood storage within a basin by restricting flows to the active channel, thereby preventing detention of floodwater in backwaters and on the adjacent floodplain.¹²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10]</td>
<td>1) Quantify and map locations of reduction in recharge rates 2) Quantify effects on channelization on shallow water tables and associated wetlands 3) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lining channel bottoms can change groundwater storage by reducing percolation and groundwater recharge.¹³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deepening natural channels can drain adjacent shallow water tables.¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C. Channel Destabilization. [11]            | Channelization can cause channel destabilization by changing the balance between the stream’s flow, sediment load, and channel form. Destabilization tends to affect entire stream systems. For example, channelization can concentrate and synchronize peak flows from tributary streams, causing increased channel erosion both above and below the channelized reach. The eroded sediment is then deposited downstream when the flow slows down, where it may initiate further destabilization.  
   D. Increased Flooding Frequency. [14]     | 1) Quantify basin-level hydrologic and fluvial geomorphic effects of channelization in each affected drainage.  
   2) Identify mitigation.                                                                                                           |
| D. Increased Flooding Frequency. [14]       | Constricted channels (e.g., in leveed sections) can cause water to back up, resulting in localized upstream flooding. Rapid passage of floodwaters through "improved" channels can increase flooding downstream by concentrating and synchronizing tributary peaks.  
   E. Decreased Pollutant Removal. [16]      | 1) Quantify basin-level hydrologic effect of channelization on each affected basin, including changes in flood return frequencies.  
   2) Identify mitigation.                                                                                                           |
| E. Decreased Pollutant Removal. [16]        | Channelization can decrease natural pollutant removal by reducing instream structural complexity and turbulent-flow aeration, increasing flow velocity, reducing overbank flow, and by causing change in vegetation.  
   F. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17] | 1) Map waters lost to channelization in each affected drainage and characterize type, areal extent, and pollutant removal value.  
   2) Quantify affect on pollutant loadings to each affected waterbody and downstream receiving waters.  
   3) Identify mitigation.                                                                                                           |
| F. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17] | Channelization and associated maintenance can directly destroy wetland and riparian vegetation and can change site features to prevent reestablishment of characteristic species.  
   | 1) Map and Identify types and areas of affected vegetation.  
   2) Identify mitigation.                                                                                                           |
### Potential Effects of Urban Transportation Development on BUs and ROD Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Needed Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>Channelization and associated maintenance can directly impair beneficial uses by reducing waterbody area; increasing stream velocity; disrupting riffle and pool sequences; cover, and other structural features; changing substrate; cutting off nutrient inputs to and from backwaters and riparian wetlands; dewatering upstream reaches; and reducing aesthetic and recreational value. Reduced overbank flooding can adversely affect reproduction of riparian vegetation and wetland and riparian functions. Channelization can inhibit the movement of fish, other aquatic biota, and wildlife, and thus isolate and reduce the viability of populations up and downstream. Construction of channels can introduce sediment, nutrients, and toxics into the waterbody.</td>
<td>1) Identify direct and indirect effects of proposed channelization projects on beneficial uses. 2) Characterize and display at project-area and regional scales existing wetlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity. 3) Identify effects of channelization on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity. 4) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decreased Flood Storage</td>
<td>A. Increased Runoff. [9] Reduced flood storage on the floodplain and in channels, swales, wetlands, backwaters, and other natural depressions increases and accelerates runoff.</td>
<td>1) Quantify total and peak volumes of increase runoff for each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased Groundwater Pumping</td>
<td>A. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10] Increased groundwater pumping can lower water tables locally or in distant donor basins.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and map locations of project-induced changes in groundwater levels. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dry Weather Discharge</td>
<td>A. Change in Baseflow. [12] Dry weather runoff from urban activities can increase dry-paned streamflows.</td>
<td>1) Quantify hydrologic effects of dry weather flows on the baseflow of each affected drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13] Dry weather runoff can carry the pollutants generated by the activity causing the flow, e.g., pesticides, nutrients, and petrochemicals from landscape maintenance and cleaning sidewalks and vehicles. Collection of polluted dry weather flows in catch basins may result in shock loadings when it is displaced by subsequent storm flows.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and characterize pollutant loadings from activities generating dry weather runoff to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Production of Urban Pollutants</td>
<td>A. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13] Increased production of urban pollutants can cause increased delivery of pollutants to surface and groundwater.</td>
<td>1) Quantify and characterize pollutant loadings from to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EROSION                   | destabilize stream channels by changing the amount of sediment carried  | 2) Conduct geomorphic analysis of channel response to long-term reductions in sediment delivery to each affected drainage.  
|                           | into the stream. The stream may then erode or aggrade its channel     | 3) Identify mitigation.  
|                           | to balance its available energy with the changes in its sediment load. | Note: Sediment as a pollutant is considered in No. 7, “Production of Urban Pollutants.”                                                                                                                      |
|                           | 1. Increased sediment from construction causes channel aggradation,     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                           | changing stream cross sections and redirecting flows.  
|                           | 2. Decreased sediment from a paved watershed can cause channel incision and/or side-cutting. The effect may be compounded by increased runoff from the paved watershed. Aggradation may occur downstream where the flow slows and deposits the eroded sediment, which may deflect flows against the channel banks and cause further bank erosion.  |
| 9. INCREASED RUNOFF       | A. Change in Soil Erosion. [8] Increased runoff can dramatically increase soil erosion by causing greater runoff velocities which more effectively displace and carry soil particles. Construction-related soil destabilization can compound the effect.  |
|                           | B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [4] Increased runoff can reduce      | 1) Quantify increases in sheet and gully erosion resulting from increased runoff.  
|                           | groundwater recharge and lower water tables, since water draining from  | 2) Identify mitigation.  
|                           | impervious surface is unable to percolate to groundwater at that      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                           | location.  
|                           | channels by increasing the flow velocity and erosive power of the       | 2) Identify mitigation.  
|                           | stream. Head cutting, incision and/or widening of the channel, and     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                           | associated sideslope failures can result. Reduced sediment input as a  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                           | result of change in soil erosion rates can compound the effect.  
|                           | In small streams, increased runoff may also dislodge logs and other    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                           | channel features that help to define the channel.  
<p>| | |
|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13] Increased runoff increases pollutant delivery because it can more effectively carry particulate and soluble pollutants to receiving waters. Increased flow velocity reduces contact time with soil and vegetation that might otherwise remove pollutants. 33</td>
<td>1) Quantify types and quantities of increased pollutant loadings to each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Increased Flooding Frequency. [14] Increased runoff and greater transport efficiency result in higher peak flows from storms of a given return period. 34</td>
<td>1) Quantify basin level hydrologic effect of increased runoff on each affected basin, including changes in flood return frequencies. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Change in Water Temperature. [15] Increased runoff from urban areas can raise the temperature of receiving waters because runoff from impervious surfaces is often warmer than runoff from pervious surfaces or subsurface flow. 35</td>
<td>1) Model increase in water temperature along stream profile of each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18] Increased runoff can impair habitat values by flushing fish and invertebrates out of streams, increasing water level fluctuations and the velocity of flows entering wetlands, and causing salinity changes in estuaries and other nearshore marine waters. 36</td>
<td>1) Identify direct effects of increased flow on aquatic biota, hydrologic regimes of adjacent wetlands, and salinity of marine receiving waters for each affected drainage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CHANGE IN GROUNDWATER STORAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Change in Baseflow. [12] Changes in watetable level can cause changes in the dry weather baseflow of streams fed by groundwater. 39</td>
<td>1) Quantify for each affected drainage the changes in baseflow associated with lowered water tables and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17] A lowered watetable can dry up wetlands, stress or kill mature riparian vegetation, and reduce or eliminate seedling survival. 40</td>
<td>1) Identify types and areas of wetlands and riparian areas that would be affected by expected lowering of shallow water tables and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18] A lowered watetable can impair water supply and other beneficial uses which use groundwater. Seawater intrusion is possible in coastal areas. 41 Aquifer compaction and subsidence can also occur. 42 Wetland and riparian areas can be dewatered, harming associated vegetation and habitats. 43</td>
<td>1) Identify affects of expected water table lowering on water supply and other beneficial uses and map locations. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CHANNEL DESTABILIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Channelization. [3] Channel erosion can threaten property and structures, leading to placement of riprap or other engineered stabilization of critical sections. 44</td>
<td>1) Identify stream reaches in which project-induced channel destabilization may require channelization. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>NEEDED ANALYSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10]</td>
<td>Channel incision can dewater shallow aquifers adjacent to the channel. [46]</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced stream incision may dewater shallow aquifers. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13]</td>
<td>Channel erosion can result in increased suspended solids and turbidity in the water column. [47]</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches subject to project-induced destabilization, quantify changes in channel dimension, and volume of eroded material for each affected basin. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increased Flooding Frequency. [14]</td>
<td>Channel aggradation can cause local flooding by diverting flows and decreasing a stream's flow capacity. [48]</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced channel destabilization may cause aggradation and associated flooding. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Change in Water Temperature. [15]</td>
<td>Bank erosion and aggradation can increase water temperature by creating a broader channel with shallow flows, increased water surface relative to flow volume, and a smaller proportion of shaded water surface. As a result, summer water temperatures and daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations tend to be greater. [49]</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which project-induced destabilization can increase water temperature. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17]</td>
<td>Channel destabilization can encroach on riparian wetlands and undermine streamside vegetation. [50]</td>
<td>1) Identify, characterize, and map wetland and riparian areas subject to encroachment by channel destabilization. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>Channel destabilization can reduce or eliminate habitat; recreation, esthetic values, and other uses by affecting deep pools, pool-riffle ratios, undercut banks, substrate suitability, and other structural features. [51]</td>
<td>1) Identify, characterize, and map stream reaches in which channel destabilization can directly impair beneficial uses. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Increased Maintenance and Property Damage. [19]</td>
<td>Channel erosion can undermine streamside buildings, bridges, utility crossings, and other property. Aggradation can bury diversion structures and other infrastructure and may require removal to maintain flow capacity.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which destabilization may cause increased maintenance and property damage. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 12. CHANGE IN BASEFLOW  | A. Change in Groundwater Storage. [10] | Reduced stream baseflow can decrease groundwater recharge by reducing wetted area and the amount of water available for recharge in stream channels. [52] | 1) Identify and map affected stream reaches. 2) Quantify losses of recharge and water table response. 3) Identify mitigation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Change in Water Temperature. [15]</td>
<td>Decreased baseflow, typically resulting from change in groundwater storage, can cause elevated and fluctuating stream temperature because groundwater usually enters the stream at cool, stable temperatures. 53</td>
<td>1) Identify and map affected stream reaches; 2) Quantify temperature effects along stream profile. 3) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Change in Wetland and Riparian Vegetation. [17]</td>
<td>Decreased stream baseflow can cause riparian vegetation to shift to upland species. 54</td>
<td>1) Characterize and map affected riparian areas. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>1. Decreases in the amount or duration of baseflow can impair habitat quality by eliminating aquatic and riparian habitat area, reducing flow velocities, and otherwise disrupting the life cycles of plants and animals which are dependent on water. 55 2. Increases in baseflow resulting from dry weather discharge can impair waterbodies such as seasonal wetlands, vernal pools, and intermittent streams which are naturally defined by seasonal water availability.</td>
<td>1) Identify and map affected waterbody segments. 2) Characterize and quantify changes in baseflow. 3) Identify direct effects on beneficial uses. 4) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. INCREASED POLLUTANT DELIVERY</td>
<td>A. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>Urban pollutants can impair many beneficial uses, e.g., water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, and shellfish production. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. INCREASED FLOODING FREQUENCY</td>
<td>A. Channelization. [3]</td>
<td>Increased flooding can lead to channelization of the critical section to more efficiently pass flood flows. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18]</td>
<td>Increased flooding can impair habitat, 58 water supplies, navigation, and other beneficial uses. C. Increased Maintenance and Property Damage. [19]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15. INCREASED WATER TEMPERATURE | A. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18] | Increased water temperature can directly stress aquatic biota and can also affect other parameters associated with habitat quality, such as dissolved oxygen concentration and rate of chemical reactions. 59 | 1) Identify and map affected waterbody segments. 2) Quantify temperature changes. 3) Characterize effects on beneficial uses. 4) Identify mitigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
<th>NEEDED ANALYSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. DECREASED POLLUTANT REMOVAL</td>
<td>A. Increased Pollutant Delivery. [13] Less removal of pollutants by natural processes can result in greater concentrations of pollutants in receiving waters.⁵⁰</td>
<td>1) Quantify effects to pollutant loadings for each affected waterbody. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Change in Water Temperature. [15] Loss of riparian vegetation can increase maximum water temperature by exposing more water surface to the sun. Daily and seasonal temperature fluctuations also tend to be greater.⁶²</td>
<td>1) Identify and map stream reaches in which loss of riparian vegetation can increase water temperature. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Decreased Pollutant Removal. [16] Removal of vegetation adjacent to a waterbody can reduce removal of pollutants from the waterbody and from the overland flow draining to the waterbody.⁶³</td>
<td>1) Describe type, areal extent, and pollutant removal value of affected vegetation and map location. 2) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Impaired Beneficial Uses. [18] Loss of vegetation directly impairs the quality of aquatic and riparian habitat by reducing cover, structural diversity, and nutrient sources.⁶⁴ Removal of vegetation can also fragment and isolate remaining patches of habitat, resulting in decreased habitat value over large areas.⁶⁵</td>
<td>1) Identify affected waterbody segments 2) Characterize direct effects of vegetation loss on beneficial uses. 3) Characterize and display at project-area and regional scales existing wetlands, along with riparian corridors and other water features supporting habitat connectivity. 4) Identify effects of vegetation change on terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity. 5) Identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. IMPAIRED BENEFICIAL USES</td>
<td>Figure 1 - End point for water quality impairment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. INCREASED MAINTENANCE AND PROPERTY DAMAGE</td>
<td>Figure 1 - End point for maintenance and property damage effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF URBAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT ON BENEFICIAL USES

This diagram shows how urban transit development can affect beneficial uses of water.

Figure 1
Low-Impact Development References

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

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

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


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


Further Online References:

United States Environmental Protection Agency: http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/
State Water Resources Control Board

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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


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


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


April 22, 2010

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair
SANDAG Board of Directors
402 B Street,
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT

Dear Mayor Pfeiler and Board,

The Endangered Habitats League would like to offer our support for Mid-Coast Transit Alternative LRT-1 and voice our opposition to Alternative LRT-3.

The LRT-1 alternative provides a direct link to UCSD, La Jolla Village Square, and UTC. These nodes will provide the highest ridership and system efficiencies without the significant community and biological impacts that would result from the LRT-3 alternative through Rose Canyon. Additionally, the LRT-3 route does not link directly to UCSD, an essential system node.

Thank you for your consideration and for your strong leadership on the Quality of Life effort.

Regards,

Michael Beck
San Diego Director
June 1, 2010

Anne Steinberger
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

VIA EMAIL TO: ast@sandag.org and midcoast@sandag.org

Subject: CITY OF SAN DIEGO COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SEIS/SEIR) FOR THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT

The City of San Diego ("City") has received and reviewed the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the Supplemental EIR/EIS for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and appreciates this opportunity to provide comments to the SANDAG. In response to the NOP, the City has identified potential environmental issues that may result in a significant impact to the environment. Continued coordinated planning between the City, SANDAG, and other local, regional, state, and federal agencies will be essential.

Staff from the Park and Recreation, City Planning and Community Investment, Environmental Services, Storm Water, and the Development Services Departments have the following comments regarding the content of the NOP:

Park and Recreation Department, Open Space Division: Laura Ball (619) 533-6727

1. Section 5.2.1.1 – Consistency with Regional and Local Plans

Analysis of the alternatives should also include an assessment of consistency with any relevant park plans. Please include an analysis of the consistency with the Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resources Management Plan, the draft 2005 San Diego River Master Plan, and any other relevant documents for the open space areas.

2. Section 5.2.6.2 Listed or Fully-Protected Wildlife Species

The section for Least Bell’s Vireo addresses temporary construction impacts but not long-term impacts from loss of habitat and/or shading along Rose Creek and the San Diego River. Please include an analysis of these potential impacts.

3. Section 5.2.13 - Parklands
Section 5.2.13, page 5-79, includes potential impacts to Marian Bear Memorial Park, and Rose Canyon OS Park which are managed by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department Open Space Division. In addition to these areas, the Transit Project Alternatives have the potential to impact the Mission Valley Preserve, also managed by the City Open Space Division. The Mission Valley Preserve is a 51-acre wildlife preserve in the western portion of Mission Valley. It extends approximately to the Morena Boulevard bridge over the San Diego River. The Mission Valley Preserve is dedicated parkland, dedicated on June 19, 2000, Ordinance Number O-18817. All three areas are dedicated park land, which requires that the land shall not be used for any but park and recreation purposes without a changed purpose being authorized by a 2/3 vote of the people. Potential impacts to the preserve and/or the affect on all three park areas should be included in the EIR impacts assessment.

Impacts to these areas include potential acres of parkland proposed for acquisition for all of the LRT alternatives, two of the BRT alternatives, and a significantly higher amount for the Commuter Rail Alternative. For any of the alternatives that would require parkland acquisition that move forward for consideration in the EIR, please ensure close coordination with the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department Open Space Division. Additionally, the Marion Bear Recreation Council, Tecolote Citizen’s Advisory Committee (which includes the Mission Valley Preserve), and the Friends of the Mission Valley Preserve should be included for any scoping sessions/community outreach.

City Planning and Community Investment Department: Brian Schoenfisch (619) 533-6457:

1. Alternative station locations should be studied for the Tecolote, Clairemont, and Balboa stations. This should be done in order to identify locations with better bicycle and pedestrian access, as well as better potential for future infill, transit-oriented development.

2. In particular, an alternative station location should be considered for the proposed Balboa station, north and west of the proposed location, as to also serve the workers of the industrial area, to better serve the beach community, and to be located in an area which has a greater potential to redevelop with infill, mixed use transit-oriented development in the future.

Environmental Services Department: Lisa Wood, 858-573-1236

The Environmental Services Department would like to see language in the scope of the project under “Probable Environmental Effects” that mentions addressing the solid waste impacts associated with the project.

Storm Water Department, Ruth Kolb, (858) 541-4328

Storm Water requests that impacts from storm water be evaluated and addressed in the SEIS/SEIR.
Development Services Department, Transportation Development Section: Ann Gonsalves, PE (619) 446-5294

1. The transportation impact analysis prepared for the SEIR should follow the guidelines of the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual, July 1998, including various scenarios to be included, for all roadway facilities within the City of San Diego evaluated. Roadway facilities to be evaluated should include roadway segments and intersections where any project alternative would add more than 50 directional peak-hour trips, and metered freeway on-ramps where any project alternative would add more than 20 peak-hour trips.

2. The transportation impact analysis prepared for the SEIR should apply the City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds, January 2007 for all roadway facilities within the City of San Diego evaluated.

3. The transportation impact analysis prepared for the SEIR should discuss and fully evaluate the potential traffic and parking impacts of the following:

   - Increased station area traffic
   - Conversion of existing travel lanes to exclusive or semi-exclusive transit lanes, and its effects on street capacity and level of service
   - Transit signal priority phasing and its effects on intersection operations and traffic queuing
   - Construction of fixed guideways and its effects on traffic and circulation including any diversion of vehicular left and right turn movements to nearby intersections.
   - Queuing between closely spaced intersections. Mitigation should be provided for queues between intersections which degrade the calculated level of service at those intersections.
   - Impacts on bicycle and pedestrian facilities
   - Any loss of on-street parking, its effects on the supply of on-street residential parking, and whether the loss of parking would severely impede the accessibility of a public facility.

4. The transportation impact analysis should evaluate the impact of the Mid Coast LRT project on current bus and rail transit capacities, ridership and level of service.

5. Mitigation measures on City facilities should be included in the transportation impact analysis for the SEIR. Mitigation suggested by the traffic consultant should be coordinated with the City of San Diego prior to publication of a Draft SEIS/SEIR to ensure agreement on identification of appropriate mitigation, timing of each mitigation, etc.
6. Cumulative development projects in the project area should be identified/updated in coordination with the City’s City Planning & Community Investment and Development Services Departments.

7. The environmental document should include alternatives that avoid or lessen expected transportation impacts, including at least one alternative that would avoid significant impacts to the City of San Diego’s streets and transit systems.

**Development Services Department, Environmental Analysis Section, Martha Blake, (619) 446-5375**

1. The environmental document should analyze impacts to all resources within the City of San Diego boundaries consistent with the City of San Diego’s Significance Determination Thresholds. Appropriate mitigation should be proposed consistent with all applicable City of San Diego Guidelines (including but not limited to Biology, Acoustical, and Historical). Staff from EAS would be happy to provide copies of any documents or links to the City website where those documents can be located.

2. As noted by CPCI comments, consideration should be given to additional and/or alternate station locations. This is especially true in the area between the proposed Balboa Avenue station and the station near Nobel Drive. The area north of Balboa contains a number of businesses and an RV park that may benefit from locating a station in that vicinity. Consideration should also be given to a station near the Gilman Drive/I-5 interchange area. There is an existing Park & Ride lot located west of the interchange, a number of residential communities on both sides of I-5, as well as a bike path, all of which may benefit from a trolley stop at that location.

Please contact the appropriate above-named individual(s) if you have any questions on the submitted comments. The City respectfully requests that you please address the above comments in the EIR.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cecilia Gallardo, AICP
Assistant Deputy Director
Development Services Department

cc: Laura Ball, Senior Planner, Park and Recreation Department
    Brian Schoenfisch, Senior Planner, City Planning and Community Investment
    Lisa Wood, Senior Planner, Environmental Services Department
Ruth Kolb, Program Manager, Storm Water Department
Ann French Gonsalves, Senior Traffic Engineer, Development Services Department
Martha Blake, Senior Planner, Development Services Department
To Whom It May Concern:

Friends of Rose Canyon submits the following scoping comments on the Mid-Coast Corridor transit project. Our organization’s mission is to protect, preserve and restore Rose Canyon and the Rose Creek watershed. The Rose Creek watershed is an important coastal watershed that extends from its upper reaches on Marine Corp Base Miramar west through Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon and then south along Rose Creek to Mission Bay. The LRT 3 alternative would have by far the greatest impact on the watershed, and we strongly oppose this alternative. However, all LRT alignments would have major impacts on the watershed. The SEIS/SEIR must thoroughly analyze these impacts and discuss avoidance, minimization and mitigation.

In the following comments, page numbers, section numbers and tables refer to SANDAG’s Mid-Coast Corridor Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, March, 2010.

I. The LRT 3 alternative conflicts with goals and objectives of the project and has significantly greater environmental impacts than LRT 1 or LRT 6. It should not be moved forward for detailed analysis in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

P. S-19 states: “The potential ecological resource impacts would be greater under LRT Alternative 3 than the other LRT alternatives. This alternative would have a greater potential for impacts to sensitive habitat and wetlands.” (Table S-3 wrongly rates LRT 3 equal to the other LRT alternatives for the Project Need: “Limit impacts to sensitive environments.”)

Goals and Objectives (p. S-4 – S-5)
Livability: Smarter growth land uses implies increased density. This can in turn decrease rather than increase livability if the project destroys open space parks and other natural areas that contribute to the quality of life in an increasingly dense urban environment.
Sustainability: “Limit potential impacts to sensitive habitats.”

P. 2-1 states that the SANDAG Regional Policy Objectives considered important in an LPA (Table 2-2) include: “Limit impacts to sensitive habitats.”

The LRT alignment through Rose Canyon would severely impact much of Rose Canyon Open Space Park with both direct and indirect impacts, including parklands/recreation areas, visual and aesthetic, natural resources, noise and vibration, wetlands, and neighborhood character. The park is a long, fairly narrow canyon. The LRT 3 would be clearly visible and audible from everywhere in the park, and has projected 7.5-minute headways in 2030. The project would require major grading and retaining walls for another set of tracks, catenary poles and wires, and, it appears, fencing. LRT 3 would have:

- by far the greatest number of linear feet adjacent to parklands (5-79)
  (14,234 for LRT 3 vs. 4,923 for LRT 1)
- by far the greatest number of linear feet of wetland impacts (p. 5-62)
  (9,070 for LRT 3 vs. 6,844 for LRT 1)
- by far the greatest impact on listed species habitat (p. 5-56)
  (212 acres for LRT 3 vs. 131 acres for LRT 1)

LRT 3 would conflict with the City of San Diego’s stated purpose for its open space parks. The City of San Diego’s webpage on Open Space Parks states:

“Open Space within the City of San Diego is defined as areas generally free from development or developed with low intensity uses that respect natural environmental characteristics. Open Space Parks are used for purposes such as preservation of natural resources, passive outdoor recreation and scenic and visual enjoyment.” As a regional resource, Rose Canyon Open Space Park is used by people from all over San Diego, who come to bike, hike, jog, birdwatch, enjoy nature, and participate in volunteer restoration projects and scout projects.

LRT 3 would conflict with the increasing use of Rose Canyon Open Space Park by schools for educational field trips. About 4500 students attend the four schools within walking distance of Rose Canyon Open Space Park (Spreckels Bilingual Magnet Elementary, Curie Elementary, Standley Middle School, University City High School). These schools bring hundreds of students a year to the park for educational field trips, with the number increasing. These field trips require no buses, and thus reduce GHG emissions and reduce cost to the schools at a time when budgets are being cut. They thus support the Mid-coast Project’s goals of Livability and Sustainability.

The Alternatives Analysis severely underestimates the visual and noise impacts of LRT 3 on Rose Canyon Open Space Park by citing the presence of the existing rail tracks and Amtrak, Coaster and freight operations. The visual impacts due to LRT 3 would be far greater, requiring major grading, large retaining walls, another set of tracks, presumably fencing, plus poles and catenary wires, and frequent passage of trolleys. The noise impacts would also be vastly greater. Currently the Coaster runs primarily during
rush hour on weekdays, does not run on Sunday, and has a very reduced schedule on Saturday. Freights run at night. Thus the visual and noise impact of the existing trains on park users is far less than the impact were the trolley to be added.

II. Cumulative Impacts
Although LRT 3 would have the greatest impacts, all LRT alternatives would have substantial impacts in combination with other projects.

1. The SEIS/SEIR should study the cumulative impacts of any proposed alignment on the Rose Creek watershed, including Rose Canyon, Rose Canyon Open Space Park, San Clemente Canyon, Marion Bear Memorial Park, and the entire length of Rose Creek. The cumulative impacts analysis should include the cumulative direct and indirect impacts of construction, operation and maintenance activities of the Mid-Coast Corridor in combination with and relation to past, present and future projects, including, but not limited to the following:

   - The proposed High Speed Rail (HSR) project alignment along the existing railroad tracks from Miramar Road by MCAS Miramar to Old Town
   - The proposed Regents Road bridge project (see Attachments for comment letters on environmental issues related to impacts on Rose Canyon)
   - Double tracking of the railroad tracks south of SR-52
   - The City of San Diego’s Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s 2007 Miramar trunk sewer project
   - The Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation project in Rose Canyon
   - Potential sewer access paths by the City of San Diego’s Metropolitan Wastewater Department
   - Storm water maintenance activities included in the City of San Diego’s Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program Final EIR, including potential impacts due to mitigation projects in the Rose Creek watershed
   - New development anticipated by or associated with the Mid-Coast Corridor Project and the HSR project

2. The cumulative impacts analysis should comprehensively study the following areas of impact:
   - Biology; hydrology; wetlands; water quality; landform alteration, including new access roads, grading and retaining walls; wildlife habitat, movement, and wildlife corridor impacts; the MSCP; noise; vibrations; visual and aesthetic impacts; sensitive and threatened and endangered species; existing and future recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marion Bear Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bikeway); impacts on the Rose Creek watershed (including Mission Bay); archeological and cultural impacts; neighborhood character. The discussion of wildlife should include the loss or degradation of habitat, and habitat fragmentation impacts.

3. The cumulative impacts analysis should study the traffic impacts, including induced traffic and increases in traffic on local streets due to Project-related TOD,
parking, and stations. The traffic impacts should include the potential of the Project to increase pressure for construction of additional paved surfaces and road construction.

III. Direct and indirect impacts of any of the LRT alternatives. This must include impacts of construction, operation and maintenance, including temporary or permanent access.

1. The SEIS/SEIR should study all direct and indirect impacts on the Rose Creek watershed, including those listed under the cumulative impacts comment above: Biology; hydrology; wetlands; water quality; landform alteration, including new access roads, grading and retaining walls; wildlife habitat, movement, and wildlife corridor impacts; the MSCP; noise; vibrations; visual and aesthetic impacts; sensitive and threatened and endangered species; existing and future recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marion Bear Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bikeway); impacts on the Rose Creek watershed (including Mission Bay); archeological and cultural impacts; neighborhood character. The discussion of wildlife should include the loss or degradation of habitat, and habitat fragmentation impacts.

2. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on the Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation project in Rose Canyon.

3. The SEIS/SEIR should analyze compatibility with the MSCP and direct and indirect impacts on MSCP areas in Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon.

4. The SEIS/SEIR must describe in detail, including accurate satellite-image maps, the exact location of the Project, including access routes and construction areas of impact. The absence of any satellite image mapping in the Draft Comparative Analysis of Alternatives has made it extremely difficult for the public to comment fully in scoping comments. For example, we have tried to find out the exact location of the property listed as potential “parkland take”, and SANDAG has been unable to provide it.

5. The SEIS/SEIR should analyze direct and indirect impacts on Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park. Impacts include, but are not limited to: parkland, visual and aesthetic, natural resources, wildlife and ecosystems, endangered species, and recreational and educational uses of the parks.

6. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on Rose Creek and the San Diego River, including environmental (water quality, threatened and endangered species, wetland habitat, the need to increase channelization or opportunities to decrease channelization).

7. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on the Rose Creek bike path and potential new recreational opportunities along Rose Creek south of SR 52. The bike path should be preserved, and the visual and aesthetic experience of riders (and walkers) on this path should be protected.
IV. The SEIS/SEIR should study the compatibility of the alignment through Rose Canyon with the following:
   • University Community Plan, including landform, visual quality, view character and neighborhood character
   • Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment
   • City of San Diego General Plan

V. Mitigation
The SEIS/SEIR should:
1. Consider mitigation that includes open space acquisition in and around Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park.

2. Fully analyze the impacts of any proposed mitigation, including any need for creating road access, and propose mitigation projects that avoid such impacts. For example, projects that rely on large numbers of volunteers might be an alternative

3. Consider ways to reduce visual and noise impacts on the western end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park, such as with earthen berms. Another possibility would be to begin tunneling sooner for the tunnel under La Jolla Colony Drive, and construct a berm above it that would reduce noise impacts from I-5. Once the LRT emerges from the tunnel along the east side of I-5, a sound wall on the east side of the LRT alignment could reduce noise to the adjacent La Jolla Colony residences, the bike path, and Rose Canyon Open Space Park.

VI. The SEIS/SEIR should take into account the information in comment letters submitted on the UC North/South Transportation Corridor Project EIR and the research studies by Kevin Crooks on the impacts of habitat fragmentation in San Diego canyons.

Sincerely,

Deborah Knight
Executive Director
May 25, 2010

VIA Fax Transmission (619) 699-1905

Ms. Leslie Blanda
Mid-Coast Comments, Draft SEIS/SEIR
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92010

RE: Mid-Coast Trolley Project

Dear Ms. Blanda:

The Friends of Rose Creek wanted to take this opportunity to provide comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR for the Mid Coast Project. Over the past 5 years, the Friends of Rose Creek has organized trash clean ups, embarked on projects in conjunction with San Diego Environmental Services, performed habitat restoration and advocated for the creek. We have involved students and scouts in a number of hands on projects.

Our vision is for lower Rose Creek to be an open space park providing recreational and learning opportunities and a clean, healthy. aesthetically pleasing environment for residents, visitors, businesses, and native plants and animals, while serving as an accessible link for bicyclists and pedestrians to move between Rose Canyon Park, Marian Bear Park, Mission Bay Park, and surrounding communities.

We are a member organization of the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance, an alliance of community organizations dedicated to improving the Rose Creek Watershed (RCW). The Alliance has prepared a guidance document that serves as a tool for decision-makers such as SANDAG to minimize the impacts of projects proposed for the watershed. In October 2008, the San Diego City Council accepted the Rose Creek Watershed Assessment (Assessment) as a guidance document for activities in the watershed. In fact, the Assessment contains a series of recommendations that if implemented or considered by project proponents such as SANDAG would enhance the watershed. The recommendations for action are in section 2 of the Assessment. The Assessment can be found on the project website at www.rosecreekwatershed.org.

We ask that SANDAG review in the Draft SEIS/SEIR each recommendation of the Assessment found in section 2 and specifically address the potential of the Mid Coast Project to implement and/or undermine or controvert each recommendation.

*A member of the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance
*A Friends Group of San Diego Canyonlands, Inc.

Visit us on-line at http://www.saverosecreek.org
The Friends of Rose Creek opposes the proposed LRT through Rose Canyon and any other routes that travel outside of the existing railroad right of way, through Rose Canyon Open Space Park past the I-5/Gilman Drive off ramp, and through any of the parklands of Marian Bear Natural Park.

We respectfully request the Draft SEIS/SEIR provide details for any contour changes to Rose Creek including, but not limited to plans which would move the alignment of the creek, channelize any portion of the creek, underground any section of the creek or its tributaries and impede existing creek flow in any manner. We request the Draft SEIS/SEIR also address the cumulative impacts for other projects proposed for the area when consider the potential impacts of the trolley. These include but are not limited to California High Speed Rail, Amtrak/Coaster improvements, and proposed bridges in the area. As a California impaired water body, we request the Draft SEIS/SEIR identify opportunities for improving water quality in areas along the rail right of way.

All mitigation opportunities for work performed adjacent to Rose Creek south of Highway 52 and north of Santa Fe Street needs to be performed in this stretch of the creek including the impacts of construction and ongoing maintenance of the trolley and we request the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address this issue. We strongly urge SANDAG to find an alignment that results in a zero loss to existing parks.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR should also address funding for implementation of and maintenance of items in the Assessment including, but not limited to:

- Safe and legal track railroad track crossings to allow residents of University City, Clairemont and Pacific Beach to move freely within these communities on foot and bicycle.
- Restoration of currently degraded habitat and removal of concrete impediments where feasible to allow a more natural wetland habitat to thrive.
- New trails to support visitor enjoyment of the area.

We want to insure that no degradation to the Rose Canyon Bike Path is a result of ANY transportation projects in the area. This is one of the most heavily used bike paths in the county and serves as a major non-motorized transportation corridor. Therefore, we specifically request that the Draft SEIS/SEIR address aesthetic, visual and noise related impacts to the user experience on the Rose Canyon Bike Path.

Respectfully,

Karin Zirk
On Behalf of the Friends of Rose Creek
May 12, 2010

Ron Roberts, County Supervisor
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Dear SANDAG Board of Directors:

The Lawrence Family JCC, JACOBS FAMILY CAMPUS has been an essential community resource and program provider since 1945. The JCC has a long history of providing high quality family programs including day care for 350 children from 18 months to 5 years, day camp for 1200 campers, after school programs, senior adult center for 1,000 seniors, a wide variety of Jewish Cultural programs with over 40,000 participants each year and a full array of sports and fitness offerings for all ages. In 1982 the JCC established its presence on 13 acres in UTC to eventually build the current 97,000 sq ft facility. The JCC averages over 140,000 visitations on a monthly basis which breaks down to 35,000 unduplicated people participating in a wide range of activities. For over 65 years, the JCC has provided a gathering place for thousands of worthy projects and programs and a cultural source for all ages. The JCC is very proud to be open and welcoming to the entire community and is very appreciative of the great support and involvement it has received over the years.

Since the JCC is such an active facility with such tremendous foot traffic, the Trolley extension is of utmost importance to us. It is our belief that bringing the Trolley to the Golden Triangle is a crucial and necessary move for the city to take. We understand that there are three alternate routes being planned and would like to go on record supporting route LRT 1 which goes through UCSD along Genesee Avenue and ending at UTC Mall. We are confident that this route will provide the greatest amount of flexibility to the community with the least amount of public disruption.

We are very much opposed to the other two alignments, LRT 3 and 6; both of these routes would be very disruptive to the JCC operations, put individuals (especially our children and seniors) at risk due to traffic patterns and create an unfathomable hardship on the 35,000 individuals that utilize the facility on a regular basis. Since these routes travel along Executive Drive, our main entrance, the noise would be very disruptive to our 500 seat Garfield Theatre which is used an average of 48 weeks per year.

The JCC is thriving and benefiting thousands of individuals - from the very young to the young at heart in their golden years - who substantially rely on us for their physical, mental and emotional well-being. We look forward to a very long and productive future in the Golden Triangle serving not only our neighborhood but also our city overall. Our goal is to continue meeting the needs of the growing community and being a good partner and community resource. We believe strongly that LRT 1 would help us achieve our mission to better serve San Diego.

While we feel the Trolley will benefit the JCC, we believe it is even more essential for the overall community.

Sincerely,

David Wax
Immediate Past President

cc: Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director
Ron Roberts, County Supervisor

David Wax
Immediate Past President
DATE: June 1, 2010

TO: Leslie Blanda, Mid Coast Project Manager, SANDAG

FROM: Ann Van Leer for the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance

SUBJECT: Mid Coast Scoping Comments, Draft SEIS-SEIR

Thank you for the opportunity to present scoping comments on the proposed Draft SEIS/SEIR for the Mid Coast Project.

We write as members of the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance, an alliance of community organizations dedicated to improving the Rose Creek Watershed (RCW). Over the past 6+ years we have been working together and with San Diego Earthworks (SDEW) as stakeholders of a plan to improve the Rose Creek watershed which begins on MCAS Miramar at the headwaters of Rose and San Clemente creeks and ends in Mission Bay at De Anza Cove. The plan, known as the Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment (Assessment), was developed by San Diego Earthworks using funds provided by the Coastal Conservancy, the San Diego Foundation and the County of San Diego. The Assessment was supported by the City Council in 2008 as a guidance document for the watershed. The Assessment can be found on the project website at www.rosecreekwatershed.org.

As a guidance document, the Assessment is a tool that can be used by decision-makers such as SANDAG to minimize the impacts of projects proposed for the watershed. In fact, the Assessment contains a series of recommendations that if implemented or considered by project proponents such as SANDAG can enhance the watershed and, in the case of Mid Coast, could help SANDAG better meet its Mid Coast Corridor Transit Project Goals and SANDAG Regional Policy Objectives; the recommendations for action are in section 2 of the Assessment.
San Diego Earthworks has been working to implement the recommendations of the Assessment including the development of a watershed hydrology model that will be available to SANDAG and others proposing watershed projects. Some data-sharing between SANDAG and the watershed project has already occurred and we encourage SANDAG to utilize the Assessment and associated technical resources so as to not duplicate efforts and to maximize use of limited public resources.

Potential Impacts of the Mid Coast Corridor Transit Project (Mid Coast Project) on the Rose Creek Watershed

The Mid Coast Project, as proposed in all alternatives, will traverse the spine of the lower watershed, an area we call Lower Rose Creek south of SR-52 and extending north of SR-52 to La Jolla Colony Drive. In Alternative 3, it will also head east into Rose Canyon. By your own draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, Alternative 3 will have a significantly greater impact on the environment. For this reason, we support the removal of Alternative 3 from consideration and encourage SANDAG to evaluate Alternatives 1 and 6 only with Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative.

Because all proposed alignments have the potential to significantly affect the RCW, and possibly foreclose the improvements recommended in the Assessment, we ask that SANDAG review in the Draft SEIS/SEIR each recommendation of the Assessment found in section 2 and specifically address the potential of the Mid Coast Project to implement and/or undermine or controvert each recommendation. While we request that SANDAG review and comment on all the Assessment recommendations, we have highlighted below those where the potential nexus between the projects is strongest and encourage SANDAG’s specific consideration of the following:

Protecting and Enhancing Biological Resources and Controlling Invasive Exotic Species

The Assessment recommendations include enhancing the biological connection of the RCW to Mission Bay through Lower Rose Creek, controlling invasive species throughout the watershed, restoring and enhancing habitats throughout the watershed, protecting and enhancing wildlife corridors (including Lower Rose Creek) through minimizing, eliminating or improving existing barriers or eliminating impacts to new barriers and establishing consistent land management throughout the RCW.

Today habitat and land management is disjointed throughout the watershed based largely on ownership. For example, in some areas there is active management of invasive species, such as in Marian Bear Memorial Park and Rose Canyon Open Space Park; in other areas no habitat management occurs at all such as in the current MTS/MTDB rail right of way. What that means in the rail right of way is that invasive plant seeds are spread by the movement of trains through the watershed. The result of this current lack of resource management by MTS/MTDB is degradation of the quality of the watershed’s biological resources. With additional trains passing through the corridor as a result of the Mid Coast
Project, additional infection will occur. According to the California Invasive Plant Council, invasive plants displace native plants and wildlife, increase wildfire and flood danger, consume valuable water, degrade recreational opportunities, and destroy productive range that would otherwise be available to support wildlife including endangered and threatened species. The Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) calls for the control of invasive species for the same reasons.

Assessment recommendation 2.2.2 calls for the management of invasives throughout the watershed in management zones, including zone 7, the rail right of way. We recommend that the Draft SEIS/SEIR analyze the impact of the Mid Coast Project on the spread of invasive exotic species and consider as potential mitigation of that impact that MTS/MTDB begin active management of invasive species in the existing right of way through the entire watershed (as seeds are both wind-blown and move downstream) to control the spread of invasive plants associated with rail use of the watershed.

Concerning barriers to wildlife movement and recreational use, new trains will restrict wildlife movement through the watershed and the potential impacts must be reviewed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. However, more significantly than moving trains, any fencing of the tracks could seriously restrict wildlife movement directly counter to recommendations of the Assessment and the MSCP. New trains will also affect public recreational movement in the watershed and could create serious user conflicts. Accordingly, we oppose any fencing of the tracks or rail corridor unless the specific purpose is to enhance and/or direct wildlife movement and enhance public safety. The Assessment addressed the issue of recreational crossings in Recommendation 2.5.5 which we discuss later in this letter.

The Draft SEIR/SEIS must also evaluate other impacts on wildlife, including but not limited to: habitat loss and alteration, noise, and lighting. All LRT alignments will have impacts on areas adjacent to and in the MSCP. The Draft SEIR/SEIS must fully evaluate and address these impacts.

Establishing consistent land management throughout the watershed is a very important issue for the stakeholders. A long-term goal is to connect the upper and lower watershed (Rose and Marian Bear Memorial parks with Lower Rose Creek to Mission Bay) as one regional natural open space resource. The current disjointed management as described earlier leads to a loss in resource value and degradation of taxpayer investment.

As another example of this, the native habitat at the west end of Marian Bear Memorial Park that extends into and south along Lower Rose Creek is some of the highest quality habitat in the entire watershed. This is the same habitat that SANDAG proposes to convert to rail right of way in 5.2.13 of the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives. This habitat begins in Marian Bear Memorial Park and extends into Lower Rose Creek. The northern portion, which is the highest quality, benefits from the management of Marian Bear Memorial Park but as the creek moves south and management ceases, infections by invasive species begin, and the creek becomes a haven for illegal activities. Yet Lower Rose Creek could serve as a flood control channel and a regional recreational resource if managed consistently.
A fundamental purpose of the Assessment is to encourage management of the watershed as an integrated natural, flood control and recreational resource to maximize public benefits and taxpayer resources. As mentioned earlier, the rail corridor should be managed consistent with that integrated effort (but has not been to date). Reducing the amount of park land in the watershed, especially parklands with quality habitat, as SANDAG has proposed, should be avoided as it runs counter to creating an integrated natural system. Accordingly, we oppose the proposal to sell any public parklands to add to the rail right of way as described in Draft Comparative Evaluation 5.2.13 on page 5-79 as inconsistent with enhancing the watershed and detrimental to creation of an integrated regional open space system. It is also inconsistent with SANDAG’s own Regional Policy Objective to limit potential impacts to sensitive habitats. We encourage instead that the proposed rail alignment stay within the current rail right of way.

Maximizing the Benefits of Mitigation

Assessment Recommendation 2.2.3 calls for the expansion and enhancement of riparian and wetland habitats and the restoration of upland habitats. Additionally, recommendation 2.6 calls for the development of data and models to help understand the hydrology and hydraulics of the watershed, reduce erosion, investigate the feasibility of modifying or removing concrete flood control channels and reduce water pollution.

The Assessment also includes recommendations identifying specific candidate restoration sites for potential improvements and calls for further analysis of those sites including modeling and consideration of their potential positive and negative impacts. Depending on the impacts that SANDAG must mitigate for the Mid Coast Project, these Assessment-recommended sites could be appropriate for Mid Coast Project mitigation and we would encourage they be considered as part of the Draft SEIS/SEIR so that mitigation and restoration efforts can be coordinated and implemented seamlessly.

As you know, SDEW has received a grant to develop the hydrology and hydraulic data as recommended in the Assessment and that study is well underway. One of the original impetuses for the Assessment was to investigate whether any of the current concrete flood control channel could be removed without negatively affective flood carrying capacity. An associated task was to model the potential restoration sites recommended in the Assessment, to verify their feasibility and potential impact on watershed hydrology.

We urge SANDAG to work closely with the Rose Creek watershed team to share data and use the hydrology and hydraulic models to analyze the impacts of the Mid Coast Project on the watershed including erosion and channel undercutting, both of which are current issues in the watershed. We oppose any additional concrete channelization or cover of San Clemente or Rose creeks as inconsistent with the Assessment’s goal to enhance and improve the watershed. However, should new concrete be necessary in the channel under Highway 5 and 52, we urge SANDAG to mitigate that through removal of concrete elsewhere in the channel so there is an overall net gain (i.e., a reduction in concrete cover) as a result of the Mid Coast Project.
Also, importantly, any mitigation associated with impacts to Rose Canyon or San Clemente canyons (including the City Parks) must take place in those canyons. Additionally, any impacts to Lower Rose Creek must be mitigated in Lower Rose Creek.

Supporting and Enhancing Regional Recreational Connections

While reducing concrete channel in the watershed was one of the original tenets of the watershed Assessment, another was to preserve and enhance the recreational opportunities in the watershed. The proposed Alternatives parallel and/or cross the existing Rose Canyon bicycle path, and any impacts to the path users (including visual impacts and noise impacts) and the path itself should be included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Related to that, a key proposal of the Assessment is to connect the communities of Clairemont and University City to Mission Bay so that a pedestrian or cyclist could travel all the way to the bay without crossing a public street. Assessment Recommendation 2.5.3 addresses this with proposals to connect existing Class 1 bicycle paths through the watershed including along Lower Rose Creek.

As you know, the Coastal Conservancy has recently awarded a grant to the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition to refine the planning for this key trail connection that will also serve as a portion of the California Coastal Trail through this part of the county. The footprint for this trail connection parallels the footprint of the Mid Coast Project alignment through Lower Rose Creek. Preliminary analysis done for the Assessment found there is enough room in the corridor for both the Mid Coast Project and the new bicycle and pedestrian trail. However, it is critical that planning for both projects be coordinated and integrated.

We urge SANDAG to work closely with the San Diego Bicycle Coalition and the watershed team to coordinate its planning for the Mid Coast Project with the existing Rose Canyon bike path and the proposed Coastal Trail through the same corridor to help the Mid Coast Project better meet its own goals to increase the overall capacity of the transportation system in the study area, as cyclists and pedestrians can use the trail to reach the trolley and the trolley to reach the trail (and Mission Bay). Doing so also advances SANDAG’s goals to reduce VMT and VHT in the corridor as the north/south route will provide a new, safe venue for bicycle commuters. Additionally, it helps SANDAG meet its Regional Policy Objectives to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We urge SANDAG to work with the San Diego Bicycle Coalition and the watershed planning team to refine this proposed trail further and implement it as part of the implementation of the Mid Coast Project.

Creating Safe and Legal Railroad Crossings

Directly related to creating new regional recreational connections is the need to implement safe and legal rail crossings in the watershed. Assessment recommendation 2.5.5 addresses this and suggests alternative locations where crossings could occur. The current system of recreational users of the watershed constantly crossing the tracks is untenable, unsafe and
illegal. It is essential for public safety that SANDAG address this issue as part of the planning for the Mid Coast Project and the California Coastal Trail and implement safe legal crossings of the tracks as part of the Mid Coast Project. The Assessment recommends where crossings could occur; we urge SANDAG to work with the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition and the watershed planning team to refine these crossings further and implement them as part of the implementation of the Mid Coast.

Enhancing the User Experience in the Watershed

The Assessment proposes to enhance the watershed for people as well as animals. As a result of implementation of the Assessment, the watershed will become an even better place to recreate than it is today. Yet, the Mid Coast Project will have visual, noise and other impacts on animals as well as people, potentially undermining the quality of the user experience. We request the Draft SEIS/SEIR address this both in the context of the user experience in the watershed today, but also how the user experience could be enhanced as a result of implementation of the Mid Coast Project. Furthermore a key component to the user experience is the amount and variety of wildlife in the corridor. We therefore request that the impacts to wildlife viewing experiences both today and as a result of implementation of the mid Coast Project be addressed.

Cumulative Impacts

There are a variety of projects planned for the watershed at this time. The cumulative impacts of these proposed projects must be addressed by the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The projects include, but are not limited to: high speed rail; LOSSAN; the Regent’s Road Bridge; Coastal Rail Trail; Wet Weather Intermittent Stream Discharge Study; City of San Diego storm drain maintenance; Highway 5 improvements and AMTRAK improvements. The Draft SEIS/SEIR must address the cumulative impacts associated with the construction, operation and long term maintenance of the Mid Coast Project as well as all other proposed projects in the watershed. The evaluation of cumulative impacts must include (but not be limited to) biology, hydrology, water quality, noise and vibration, wetlands, lighting, visual and aesthetic impacts, wildlife and ecosystems impacts (including sensitive, threatened and endangered species), recreation, and impacts on Marion Bear Memorial Park, Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Lower Rose Creek and the MSCP.

Making the Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives and the Draft SEIS/SEIR More User Friendly

One of the difficulties in responding to this scoping is that the level of detail provided in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives is not sufficient to determine the footprint of the impacts. We request that the Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives and the Draft SEIS/SEIR both include a high quality aerial, such as a Google Map, at a scale of at least 1:200 (preferably 1:100 and 1:200) for each alignment evaluated so that the public can review each section of the route in greater detail.
An additional public benefit would be to provide this same information on the project website as an overlay on Google Earth showing the area of impact from the centerline of each rail line, to the right of way and any additional limits of the impact, including construction impacts. Providing this information to the public will help SANDAG in the short and long run as the public will be able to better understand the specific impacts on the ground associated with the Mid Coast Project and will be able to better direct their comments.

We appreciate SANDAG’s consideration of our comments and its attention to date to the watershed.

Sincerely,

Ann Van Leer
Convener for San Diego Earthworks

Karm Zirk
Friends of Rose Creek

Deborah Knight
Friends of Rose Canyon

Brent Banta
Marian Bear Park Recreation Council

Ben Stevenson
Rose Canyon Recreational Council

Brooke Peterson
Clairemont Mesa Planning Group

Kathy Keehan
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Carroll Zahn
Nobel Recreation Council

Judith A. Swink
Mission Bay Park Committee

Andy Hanshaw
Discover Pacific Beach

James A. Peugh
San Diego Audubon
March 29, 2010

Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project - Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report and Project Scoping

The San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club has more than 14,000 members throughout San Diego County and in every jurisdiction on the SANDAG Board.

We urge the Working Group to ask the SANDAG Board to include Bus Rapid Transit Alternatives in the EIR.

The EIR/EIS must include a BRT Alternative. The TransNet ballot measure includes specific language referencing BRT as an alternative to LRT. Therefore the public deserves a complete evaluation of BRT Alternatives in the EIR/EIS.

Furthermore, BRT Alternatives must be fairly evaluated to take into consideration the improved service connections to other parts of the region. The LRT Alternatives do not improve any services to areas north of UCSD, nor do they provide any congestion relief for traffic coming southbound to the Golden Triangle.

We urge the Working Group to recommend that SANDAG analyze as least one alternative with major trip times competitive with driving times. Without competitive trip times into and out of job centers in the Golden Triangle, people will continue to drive and the public investment will not perform as well as it should.

Finally, on the issue of what information is available to the public regarding the analysis of the alternatives, please disclose all the assumptions and make the modeling software available for public use.

Carolyn Chase
Chair
San Diego Sierra Club
For more specifics addressed to SANDAG staff and Board, please see below.

1. The Sierra Club strongly opposes Alternative 3, the LRT through Rose Canyon. Its Right-of-Way was created in a different era, without the considerations now required due to increased population growth. We cannot continue to sacrifice our remaining natural areas to intrusive infrastructure. Infrastructure in major metropolitan areas must go underground or above-grade.

2. The Sierra Club urges you to add a multi-modal Alternative that would combine:
   a. Removal of the curve in the LOSSAN corridor via creation of a tunnel with an underground station at UTC and the double tracking necessary to support reduced headways. A similar project is in the RTP.
   and
   b. Inclusion of a portion of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative 3, terminating at UCSD.

3. The Sierra Club urges the addition of two BRT Alternatives to the EIR
   The EIR/EIS must include a BRT Alternative. The TransNet ballot measure includes specific language referencing BRT as an alternative to LRT. Therefore the public deserves a complete evaluation of BRT Alternatives in the EIR/EIS.
   a. Staff BRT Alternative 3.
   This Alternative would provide superior services for all routes to the VA Hospital. The other alternatives do not provide service close enough to the VA Hospital.
   b. For another BRT Alternative, please consider a route that was not considered by your consultants: One that turns east on Nobel Drive (approx) to UTC and then follows to terminate at UCSD.
   In essence this is taking the route of LRT Alt 3 with a BRT treatment.
3. Consider a BRT expansion project to Sorrento Mesa.

4. It is essential that transit be designed from a marketing perspective to attract drivers out of their cars. Market research shows that this require travel times competitive with driving times. We urge you therefore to have an alternative in the EIR designed from this perspective.

5. Disclosure of all assumptions
   Please provide the definition of "User Benefit Hours" and how it was calculated for the different Alternatives. Please provide the other modeling assumptions made in estimating the Costs and Cost Effectiveness, Daily New Transit Trips, Daily New Transit Boarding and Annual User Benefits (Hours).

The FTA defines a New Starts Project metric call TSUB (Transportation System User Benefit). The TSUB is calculated by taking the total cost of building and operating a transit project and dividing that by the estimated travel time riders would save under the project; the result essentially is how the project's cost-effectiveness is determined. What are the TSUBs for the Alternatives?
It is our understanding that the project must also compete with respect to other measures of environmental justice. We would like to understand what those measures are and how they are analyzed in the different proposed alternatives. Finally, we would be remiss, if we didn't bring up the Big Picture question of the usage of transit resources. As we understand it, this one project would use more than $600 million dollars of local sales tax revenues. Given the recent millions of dollars in cuts to the transit system, we request the SANDAG Board consider if there wouldn't be a better investment of that amount of funding into other system-wide improvements for SANDAG. TransNet explicitly empowers the SANDAG Board to make changes to the system in response to significant changed conditions.

There is no question that the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars of planned State transit funding is a significant changed condition and you should consider taking action to replace those funds and make a difference for users throughout the transit system.

Another choice would be to use funds currently thought to be reserved for freeway expansion. If SB375 targets are in line with AB32 reductions and assuming "Pavley 1" standards, we must adopt policies that will reduce San Diego net Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) with respect to now, after 2025. (That calculation could be provided to you.)
May 11, 2010

Ms. Ann Steinberger
Mid-Coast Comments
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Scoping Comments for Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

This letter serves as the University Community Planning Group’s comments on the scope of the SEIS/SEIR for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

On April 13, 2010, at a heavily-attended meeting, SANDAG representatives presented the SANDAG staff’s recommendation based on the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, dated March 2010, to the University Community Planning Group (UCPG). A diverse group of community residents then presented their positions and concerns. Subsequently, the UCPG voted unanimously (19-0) to strongly support LRT 1 (combining LRT 1, 4 and 5) as the preferred alternative for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and to delete LRT 3, and 6 from further scoping review.

OVERVIEW OF SUPPORT FOR LRT 1
As far back as 1987, SANDAG identified a “preferred alternative” route much like the present-day LRT 1 proposal. In addition, the original 1987 University Community Plan identifies an LRT 1-like corridor that connects to UCSD and University City’s major activity centers. Further, it favors an Executive Drive station to accommodate a high density of businesses in the area. This “preferred alternative” has been studied and refined several times over the intervening years.

The overall conclusion has been the same: that an LRT 1 route best meets the multidimensional gauges (e.g. consistency with user benefit, regional and local plans, land use/economic development, and environmental considerations/sustainability) most recently articulated in the Draft.

In addition, LRT 1 is more cost effective than LRT 3 according to SANDAG analysis of alternative LRT routes.
The current overall LRT 1 proposal has widespread community support including residents from different University City neighborhoods, the Associated Students of UCSD (ASUCSD), Scripps and UCSD Hospitals, and Sciences International Applications (SAIC).

Importantly, significant community support stems from the placement of stations at Nobel Drive and Executive Drive. These stations are absent in LRT 3. The Nobel Drive Station is supported by a number of individuals and groups including the ASUCSD and representatives of the LDS Temple. LRT 1 provides access to the activities available in downtown San Diego for the many UCSD students whose off-campus apartments are concentrated in this area. This alternative also serves the area’s many businesses.

Likewise, the Executive Drive Station specifically is supported by groups as diverse as Amylin Pharmaceutical Corporation, the La Jolla Country Day School, and the Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center of San Diego, which reflects the diversity of activity in this densely-used area. The Executive Drive location is also convenient for shuttle buses to and from businesses in the Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, and Torrey Pines Mesa areas.

Although the LRT 1 alignment is most favored by the UCPG and is favored in the University Community Plan, the UCPG notes that there are a number of questions and concerns that were raised from both public comments and the UCPG Executive Committee that we are requesting to be addressed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including:

5.1.2.4 Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths

Pedestrian Bridge
In conjunction with traffic concerns, increased pedestrian access is also desirable. For example, with the aerial alignment crossing I-5, the Draft SEIS/SEIR should study the feasibility of a pedestrian bridge to link the La Jolla Colony area and LDS Temple with the Nobel station. Bicycle access along this pedestrian bridge should also be studied.

Bicycle Access
The Rose Creek bicycle path that runs along the existing right-of-way from La Jolla Colony Drive south to Sante Fe Street and Pacific Beach must be preserved. This is a heavily-used corridor for recreational and commuting cyclists.

Additionally, bike-friendly policies at the stations including bike racks and secure storage lockers are recommended to reduce car traffic to the stations and facilitate use of the stations by local residents.

5.2 Environmental Considerations
5.2.1 Land Use/Economic Development
As the University Community Plan is virtually at build out, the UCPG does not favor additional transit oriented development (TOD) around transit stations. However, it does
favor convenient shuttle access to and from high-density employment centers from large businesses, public facilities, and hospitals as well as surrounding geographical areas that attract businesses such as Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, and Torrey Pines Mesa. The Draft SEIS/SEIR should develop specific ways to provide connections to these and other employment centers.

There was significant public support at the UCPG meeting to resolve the issue of no direct access from either of the two nearby Project stations to the Veterans Administration Hospital as currently proposed. Since the VA Hospital is a Federal facility, on federally owned property, and the Federal government will likely contribute significant funding for the project, more direct access for our veterans, whether disabled or otherwise, should be studied and provided in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

Parking
The current draft plan indicates parking at both the Nobel Station and at the terminus at the Westfield-UTC Transit Center. It is likely that the local University City community will want access to the trolley for trips downtown, which will lead to increased traffic and parking demand at both the Nobel Station and the UTC Transit Center. There is currently limited parking at both sites and insufficient off-street parking in the surrounding areas.

For the Nobel Station, the study for a new structure is essential. At the UTC Transit Center, there is no increased parking for a transit facility in the University Community Plan amendment at Westfield-UTC. Reliance on walking or bus connection may be unrealistic. The Draft SEIR/SEIS needs to study the need for parking at these and all other station locations.

Traffic
The recently approved University Community Plan amendment for the Westfield-UTC expansion identified 1.5 million square feet of new retail space and 250 residential units and increased traffic by 18,000 trips. With the University City community bearing the brunt for these significant new traffic impacts, the SEIR/SEIR should study the effect on traffic to all proposed stations and consider the option of acquiring entitled trips from developers to offset any traffic increases for the Westfield-UTC Transit Station.

The impacts on both traffic during construction and operation as well as parking should be studied and mitigated where possible.

5.2.1.1. Consistency with Regional and Local Plans
The 1987 University Community Plan is consistent with the development of a light rail transit system and identified the I-5 corridor recommended by SANDAG in 1986 as well as the Nobel and Executive Drive station locations in the plan. Future park-and-ride facilities were also recommended (see issues to study under Parking above).
The University Community Plan states that Rose Canyon Open Space Park is considered a regional resource (p. 225) with regional significance and attraction and, further, that Rose Canyon should be preserved as dedicated open space and used for passive recreational uses rather than active uses requiring major grading and construction (p. 233), and that future uses of Rose Canyon should consider the topography, vegetation, and scenic value of the park to the community and serve to separate and define the neighborhoods to the north and south (p. 233, p. 226). LRT 3 would have a major impact on this regional resource and, as a result, is inconsistent with the University Community Plan.

LRT 3 is incompatible with the City’s stated purpose for open space parks: “Open Space within the City of San Diego is defined as areas generally free from development or developed with low intensity uses that respect natural environmental resources, passive outdoor recreation and scenic and visual enjoyment” (City of San Diego, Department of Park and Recreation).

5.2.2 Private Property Acquisitions and Displacement/Relocations
The Draft Report indicates for LRT 1 a total of eighteen partial private land acquisitions totaling 5.5 acres for both residential and commercial properties. We request that the Final Alternative Analysis due in July include the locations of these acquisitions.

We further request that the Final Alternative Analysis due in July include the locations of acquisition within Rose Canyon. The Draft now states these acquisitions will consist of .57 acres along 4,923 linear feet of alignment to parkland as proposed for LRT 1 or for .65 acres along 14,235 linear feet to parkland for LRT 3. Although the acreage does not significantly increase for LRT 3 over the LRT 1 alternative, the exposure of linear feet to parklands for LRT 3 does increase significantly and should be avoided.

5.2.8 Air Quality
Although the Draft Report indicates that air quality is not considered a significant factor in the selection of alternatives for scoping, what will be the studies necessary to meet the federal Clean Air Act and any other local or state requirements for air quality during construction and operation and when will those studies be conducted and mitigations proposed?

5.2.9 Geology and Soils
What field investigations and site inspections will be performed for the study of fault crossings for significant structures proposed, in particular the Rose Canyon Fault and minor faults in the area? What is the potential for earthquakes and the extent and type of such resulting earthquake damage: in a tunnel, above grade, other?

What other geographic hazard categories will be studied and how mitigated, such as landslides, slope stability (in particular in the narrow right of way along La Jolla Colony and
other similar topography), liquefaction, compressible soils, expansive soils, corrosive soils, faults rupture hazard and ground shaking?

5.2.10 Potential Construction Impacts
Will a storage or maintenance station be located in the University City area? If so, what size, what will be the impacts of visual, hazardous materials, screening, noise, etc? How will the Project communicate to the University City community their construction schedules and duration?

5.2.10.1 Visual Elements of Alternatives
The Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives indicates that there would be a greater potential for visual impact to the surrounding area because the visibility of the structure would be greater than where the guideways are at grade. What are the mitigations to be studied for the construction in areas where guideways would be constructed for aerial structures? What other visual effects of transit vehicles, guideways, fences, or stations can be mitigated for both commercial properties and residential views. (See Attachment A, which includes, but is not limited to, residential areas that should be studied.)

Any consideration of LRT 3 should study the major negative aesthetic and visual impacts on the great majority of Rose Canyon Open Space Park.

5.2.10.2 Visual Assessment of Alternatives
Although a tunnel for LRT 3 has a lower impact for visual impacts, public comments at the UCPG were against the LRT3 alternative, in part, due to tunneling under Genesee Avenue and other issues associated with tunneling such as cost, construction impacts on traffic, venting for air circulation, and safety precautions. As indicated in our opening paragraphs, the UCPG supports the deletion of LRT 3.

5.2.13 Parklands
The Draft SEIR/SEIS should study all direct and indirect impacts on Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marion Bear Memorial Park, the Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bike path) for all alternatives it studies.

The FTA Manual “Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment” on p. 5-70 defines Land Use Category 1 as land where quiet is an essential element in its intended purpose. Because Rose Canyon is an open space park used for passive recreation as stated by the City’s Park and Recreation Department, the park falls into Category 1. As a result, LRT 3 would run counter to FTA noise standards.

Water Resources
The SEIR/SEIS should study the LRT 3 route’s direct and indirect impacts on the Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation areas in Rose Canyon Open Space Park.
Plant or Wildlife Species
LRT 3 would have a greatest potential for impacts to sensitive habitat and wetlands according to SANDAG’s Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives (p. S-19). This is another reason LRT 3 should be removed from further consideration.

5.2.18 Security and Safety
What have studies shown relative to crime statistics when a trolley station is built within a community: violent and gang related crime, rape, narcotics, transients’ issues in park areas, and crimes related to property, such as residential, commercial, and auto? Does crime increase? If so, what are the mitigations that can be established? With the Northern Division of the City of San Diego identified as the only station in the area and with their large coverage area north to Torrey Pines, east to Miramar, and south to Mission Beach, what additional mitigations may be required to augment security both from the City and MTS at the North University stations?

5.2.20.5 Noise and Vibration
To what extent will noise and vibration criteria measurements be conducted to meet City, State, and FTA standards especially relative to noise frequency for all commercial, school, hospitals, park and residential areas? (See Attachment A, which includes, but is not limited to, residential areas that should be studied.)

Will noise studies include tests for current ambient noise and projected peak estimated levels relative to the distances from the proposed alignments when run at grade level both for the transit project during construction and later the project’s operations? This study should include projected 2030 operations, with projected 7.5 minute frequencies for the trolleys.

Noise mitigation needs to be studied for both outside noise levels, such as condominium common areas, streets, and parks, as well as interior noise levels?

Will noise levels be tested when windows are open and closed? Will noise mitigation efforts include the study of sound walls, dual pane windows, insulation, mechanical ventilation or air conditioning with windows closed (with required number of air changes per hour), or any other? How also will noise barrier absorption and geometry fit into a review of these different types of noise mitigation?

At what distances will noise measurements be conducted to mitigate for elevated operation which, according to the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives, can generate higher levels of sound at greater distances?

What are noise issues that will be studied for stations, storage yards or maintenance facilities?
How will wheel squeal, wheel impacts, wheel rolling and other equipment related noise be studied? Won’t ‘wheel squeal’, for example, be a greater noise impact for LRT 3 requiring tighter curves turning north by Genesee Highlands? How will impacts be assessed as noise increases due to track wear over time?

What are the cumulative effects on noise of other transportation projects such as the California High Speed Rail, SuperLoop, Regents Road Bridge, or increased traffic on I-5?

5.2.20.7 Existing Habitats
LRT 3 is not compatible with the following SANDAG Regional Policy Goal of Sustainability (as adopted in 2007 in the RTP), which lists as an objective: “Limit impacts to sensitive habitats” (p. 5-6).

Cumulative Impacts
The Draft SEIS/SEIR needs to study all cumulative impacts for this project.

In conclusion, various constituents of the University City community (resident, business, educational, healthcare, and religious groups) have expressed broad-based support for LRT 1 and opposition to LRT 3. Likewise, along with support for LRT 1, constituents have also raised concerns about details of the proposal.

The UCPG reiterates our opposition to LRT 3 and requests that it be discontinued from consideration. We request that the issues we raise in relation to LRT 1 be studied in detail and that design modifications and mitigation measures be built into the project to reduce or eliminate impacts wherever possible. We realize that these changes may come at some financial cost, but we urge SANDAG and the FTA to recognize that community support for the project as it moves forward will be well worth the price.

Sincerely,

Janay Kruger, Chair
University Community Planning Group
ATTACHMENT A
Residential Neighborhoods for Potential Noise, Vibration, and Visual Impacts

Along track alignment (West Side of I-5) on Via and Caminto Sonoma: La Jolla Village – Southpointe, La Jolla Park Villas, East Bluff, and Woodlands South

Along track alignment (East Side of I-5): La Paz Condominiums, Barcelona Patio Homes, Las Flores Apartments, Archstone Apartments, Verona Condominiums, and La Jolla Colony Park

Along Palmilla and Charmont (line of site with track alignment): Las Palmas Condominiums, Madrid Condominiums, La Regencia Apartments, La Jolla Del Sol (UCSD housing), Marbella Condominiums, Mirada Apartments, and Valencia Executive Homes

Near UCSD stations and track alignment: all UCSD housing

Near Nobel Station: Boardwalk, Cambridge, Villa Mallorca, Village Square Apartments, La Jolla Gardens, Cape La Jolla, and Woodlands North

Along Genesee Avenue and Executive Drive Station: La Jolla Vista Town Homes, La Jolla Canyon Apartments, and Canyon Park Apartments

Along Genesee and at Terminus of UTC Transit Station: Costa Verde Village, Hyatt Senior Residences, University Towne Square, and La Jolla Nobel Homes
4060 - 32
San Diego, CA 92122

Ms. Ann Steinberger
 Naval Coast Command
San Diego
401 B. Street, Suite
San Diego, CA
May 25, 2010

Anne Steinberger
SANDAG Marketing Manager
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Work Group
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

SUBJECT: UC San Diego response to Scope of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Dear Ms. Steinberger:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives under consideration by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) with respect to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Bringing additional alternative transportation options to our growing campus and to the San Diego region is critical to a healthier environment and the region’s economic vitality. This new access, both to and from the campus, will change the transportation paradigm for our students, staff and faculty as soon as operations begin, and ridership will surely increase over time. Extending the Light Rail Transit (LRT) to our West and East campuses as soon as possible is imperative to allow our campus to minimize its impact on San Diego’s freeways, local roads and intersections.

I would like to acknowledge the excellent working relationship that UC San Diego has enjoyed with SANDAG, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD). These partnerships are critical to achieve the common goal of using alternative transportation rather than relying on single occupancy vehicles. The Chancellor has and will continue to strongly support this goal at UC San Diego.

I understand and support the strategy that in July 2010 the SANDAG Board of Directors may be prepared to choose one of the three alternative alignments proposed during public scoping. This will allow SANDAG to immediately seek matching Federal funding through the Federal Transit Administration and thereby accelerate the project schedule. Our campus stands ready to continue working with SANDAG on the project design to ensure that the selected alignment serves both the campus and the community, and that any potential impacts are effectively mitigated.
We intend to be an engaged partner to ensure the safety and security of our campus community, including the students in Sixth College, adjacent to the Pepper Canyon station. This West campus station was included in the University Center/Sixth College Neighborhood Plan that was adopted by the campus in 2004. Safety and security is also a critical component for the students who attend the Preuss School, our charter middle and high school on the East campus, along with preservation of emergency and non-emergency access to the UC San Diego Medical Center. In general, safe and effective pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation to, from, and on the campus are top concerns and priorities. Based upon these concerns and others, the campus has developed a very detailed list of issues that must be addressed and mitigated by the project. Those issues include, but are not limited to, noise, vibration, safety, security, circulation, biology, construction staging, electromagnetic fields, and aesthetic impacts.

We look forward to engaging SANDAG in an iterative design process that allows us to play an active role in the development of the project located on the UC San Diego campus. Prior to developing the final alignment and station design, the campus needs to review and approve concept renderings. It is our expectation that this analysis will begin early in the process to allow sufficient time for the evaluation of how the project is integrated into the urban fabric of our campus. More specifically, we are looking for renderings/three-dimensional drawings of the project (including the type of structure, its relationship to topography, existing and future buildings, and circulation network). This information is critical to fully evaluate the project and determine what is best for the campus setting.

To continue to foster our partnership, I ask that meetings of the staff, which include representatives from UC San Diego, SANDAG, and MTS, be expanded to include Caltrans and occur on biweekly basis to ensure steady progress. The work of this group will continue to include the development of plans and agreements related to security and safety (pedestrians, bicycles and vehicular), station locations and design, track elevations (aerial versus at-grade versus tunnels), integration with Caltrans’ planned widening of Interstate 5, the proposed Voigt Drive Direct Access Ramp (DAR), a future Gilman Drive bridge crossing Interstate 5, and use of campus land for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project right-of-way and stations. Please note that the information developed by this work group will continue to be reviewed by standing campus committees, such as the Campus/Community Planning Committee, Open Space Committee, and the Design Review Board, for their review, input and recommendations to the Chancellor.

Please accept the following attachment as a broad display of concerns, impacts and general comments that have been collected from various meetings, people, and discussions over time as the campus has contemplated and discussed the concept of the LRT. These comments are based on the SANDAG Draft Comparative Analysis Report released on March 12, 2010. As aforementioned, we are ready to engage at a deeper and more detailed level as soon as possible.
Thank you, once again, for this opportunity to work on this exciting project that will provide a new mode of transportation for UC San Diego and other Mid-Coast locations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary C. Matthews
Vice Chancellor

Attachment

c: Supervisor Ron Roberts, Chair - Mid-Coast Corridor Project Working Group
   Executive Director Gary Gallegos - SANDAG
   CEO Paul Jablonski - Metropolitan Transit System
   Director Laurie Berman – Caltrans District 11
Attachment

The following is a brief summary of advantages and disadvantages as noted by the UC San Diego community for each alignment that has advanced into public scoping. Once the SANDAG Board of Directors acts in July 2010, the campus will focus much more intensively on the details of the chosen alignment(s) with the proposed LRT work group and campus standing committees.

Alternative 1
{SANDAG staff has consolidated alignments 1, 4 and 5 into Alternative 1}

Alignment 1
Advantages
- Impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized

Disadvantages
- Several at-grade crossings, impacting vehicular circulation as well as visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists
- Separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive
- Integration of LRT and proposed DAR at-grade along Voigt Drive creates a complex issue for construction phasing and operation
- Impacts to Preuss School, including safety of pedestrians
- Impacts to campus recreation lands
- Impacts to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles

Alignment 4
Advantages
- Impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized
- Aerial alignment on East Campus minimizes circulation impacts
- Potential for reduced LRT right-of-way requirements
- Regional access to East Campus station more easily accommodated at this location
- Elevated station allows for flexibility of land uses
- Aerial alignment may better integrate with proposed DAR improvements

Disadvantages
- Separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Drive
- Impacts to campus recreation lands
- Integration of LRT and proposed DAR along Voigt Drive with Campus Point Drive realignment is critical during design, construction and operation
- Coordination with access to UCSD Medical Center and East Campus needed

Alignment 5
Advantages
- Avoids Voigt Drive; ensures ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR
- Reduced impacts to Preuss School
- Regional access to East Campus station more easily accommodated at this location
- Minimizes impact to baseball field
- Eliminates impact to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles
Disadvantages
- Impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources
- Impacts to recreations lands
- Additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north
- Potential impacts to future East Campus development sites
- Campus Point Drive realignment as part of proposed DAR still being studied; may impact feasibility of this alignment

Alternative 3
Advantages
- Avoids Voigt Drive; ensures ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR
- Avoids impacts to Preuss School
- Avoids impacts to campus recreation lands
- East Campus station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center
- Avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and East Campus access

Disadvantages
- Impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital
- East Campus station location not desirable for regional access
- Potential impacts to Mesa Housing and Science Research Park
- Constrained design opportunities for future I-5/Gilman Drive bridge project

Alternative 6
Advantages
- Avoids Voigt Drive; ensures ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR
- Avoids impacts to Preuss School
- East Campus station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center
- Avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and East Campus access

Disadvantages
- Impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital
- Additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north
- East Campus station location not desirable for regional access
- Impacts to Health Sciences buildings to be constructed on East Campus (Office Buildings and CTRI Phase 2)
- Potential impacts to planned I-5/Gilman Drive Bridge
Appendix E
Email and Phone Comments
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee  
Nancy Appel [nappel@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:38 PM  
To: midcoast@sandag.org  
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Hello,

I oppose the trolley through Rose Canyon. Please preserve Rose Canyon as open space. I enjoy bird watching, biking, and hiking in Rose Canyon.

Thanks.  
Nancy Appel  
4274 Toch St.  
San Diego, CA 92117
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Melodee Arnold, RN, LMFT, CGP
3184 Carnegie Ct.
San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Daniel Arovas [darovas@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 12:43 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Daniel Arovas
3202 Lahitte Court
San Diego, CA 92122
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Eduardo Azucena
7120 Shoreline dr. #2308
San Diego, CA 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

My family and I hike in Rose Canyon and we would hate to lose the beauty of this nature preserve.

Sincerely,

Ed Baize

3911 Caminito Cassis, San Diego, CA 92122
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

N Lee and Judith A Bausch

3044 Fried Ave

San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Tama [Tamambv@msn.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:27 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Tama Becker-Varano
To All Whom It Would Concern:

I am opposed to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I beg you to please delete this route from any further consideration. Please select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. I understand this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park, but I'm willing to compromise if we get Rose Creek required mitigation.

This route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) will devastate Rose Canyon, with lots more noise, visual and environmental impacts: new tracks, added poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. I and people from all over San Diego and the nation (as an avid hiker I know this!) use this park to hike (see google search-hiking San Diego), bike, jog and enjoy nature. Thousands students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. As has my own local hiking club: Walks with God (Horizon Singles Min.) Both Marion Bear (our 1st hike) and Rose canyon recently. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand. We've even brought single parents children along to see nature and birds of prey exhibits/talks.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life. Recently we’ve had lots of beautiful color and this is an entry way to getting new hikers from walking to hiking in nature easily.

Sincerely,

Pres. dMb Enterprises & FreedomPlease.org
Co-Leader Walks with God, Horizon Singles Ministry

Daniel M. Beeman daniel_beeman@yahoo.com
P.S. As a 3 year trolley count employee I have seen that lines, like the green line, have little effective ridership vs cost and natural damage. Only two of the trips on the trolley to SDSU are full or even highly busy. Most riders are from Grossmont and Old transit stations (workers), and many just the one stop away Alvarado (45%) park-n-ride. Check the trolley counts. Better to create a loop that can provide more transportation in a circle Oldtown to, UCSD to (via Carroll Canyon Road/Fenton Rd to I-15), with spur to UTC, I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Complete the loop now while possible. Before too developed!!!

Daniel Beeman ~ HUMAN 858-571-6058 of San Diego/Clairemont
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Al Bendett [bendett@san.rr.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 4:05 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Al Bendett
5728 Honors Dr
San Diego, CA 92122
bendett@san.rr.com
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Amanda Rose Brandon

4477 Onondaga Ave.

San Diego CA 92117

Sent from my iPod
Mid Coast Project comment
Walter Brewer [catcar38@verizon.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 6:17 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

June 1 2010.

Comments regarding proposed chances to transportation in the Mid Coast corridor follow as part of the Public Participation Plan.

1), Abandon all efforts pertaining to Light Rail options.
With National, State and personal finances under severe stress, we simply cannot afford priority to nearly $1.2 billion for an 11 mile route resulting in riders saving 2 to 4 minutes average travel time compared to much less expensive improved bus options.
The claimed weekday travel of 351,000 passenger-miles is 50% more than the 19 mile trolley Blue Line achieves with its unique Mexican Border demographics. Projected population and jobs increase in the Mid Coast corridor are only 20% and 14% respectively.
It is unrealistic to believe more than half of new riders will be those who have shifted from automobiles when each would suffer about 12 minutes travel time loss and two transfers.

2), Institute instead pragmatic incremental improvement in existing bus facilities at about 5% of the LRT option cost. Prioritize better service for the core non-driver riders.
The bus example shown in draft Mid Coast analysis reports, at 5% the cost, produces over 80% the passenger-miles generated by the vastly more expensive LRT options.
Planned expansion of I-5, including HOV lanes designed at considerable expense for bus use, will make bus travel time competitive, require less land, and provide more destination and station flexibility.
About a 30% efficiency improvement can be expected in bus energy use. Small buses during off peak demand can conserve more.

3), It would help public understanding for this and other projects if the principal options, rail, bus highway, could be compared and presented in the same context of cost, utilization, energy, emissions, land use etc.

Walt Brewer
catcar38@verizon.net
Oppose Trolley through Rose Canyon-it is lovely there!
Angela Budreika [abudreika@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 11:03 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Angela, Edward, Veronika and Zara Budreika
Sorrento Valley area residents
10616 Indigo Blossom Lane, San Diego, CA 92121
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Peter Burch
2667 Angell Avenue, San Diego 92122
Mr. Burroughs,
Thank you for contacting SANDAG about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. I have provided responses to your inquiries below.

- Financial statements for the current trolley operation. This request should be directed to the Metropolitan Transit System which is responsible for trolley operations.

- Capital investment to lay the new proposed lines, purchase additional equipment and extend existing operations (new hires, etc.), plus ongoing operational cost estimates. The current cost estimate for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is $1.2 billion. The Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report includes a total estimated capital cost of each alternative.

- Study results, and who conducted the study, on the impact of additional trolley lines and operations to the affected areas—eminent domain acquisitions, automobile/pedestrian traffic disruptions, etc. This information will be developed as part of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report which is anticipated to be completed by summer 2011.

- Ridership estimates. This information is included in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives available at www.sandag.org/midcoast or on CD by request at (619) 595-5620.

- Objective pros and cons analysis of this proposed expansion. Analysis on alternatives is included in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives available at www.sandag.org/midcoast or on CD by request at (619) 595-5620.

- Prior to any public meetings, this and any other pertinent information should be made available to the public in an advertised, easily accessible location, for example the http://www.sdmts.com/Trolley web site. Since SANDAG is responsible for transit planning and construction, all notices and advertising are handled through SANDAG. Public notices/advertising announcing the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping period and meetings appeared in the following publications in advance of the scoping start date of May 3, 2010: Asian Journal, Beach and Bay Press, Clairemont Community News, El Latino, La Jolla Village News, North County Times, San Diego Community Newspaper Group, San Diego Downtown News, San Diego Union Tribune, Star News, UCSD Guardian, and the Voice and Viewpoint.

In addition, a postcard was mailed on April 30, 2010 to approximately 25,000 households and businesses within a half-mile of the alternatives in the corridor from Old Town Transit Center to University City. The information also was distributed via press release to regional and local newspapers throughout the county. In addition, information was distributed to an opt-in e-mail list managed by SANDAG. Project information is included at www.sandag.org/midcoast. And regular updates are provided to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group, Transportation Committee, and SANDAG Board of Directors—their meeting agendas, reports, and minutes are posted at www.sandag.org.

If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Anne Howard Steinberger
Marketing Manager
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
To the SANDAG Board:

I would like to see the following information made available:

- Financial statements for the current trolley operation.
- Capital investment to lay the new proposed lines, purchase additional equipment and extend existing operations (new hires, etc.), plus ongoing operational cost estimates
- Study results, and who conducted the study, on the impact of additional trolley lines and operations to the affected areas-- eminent domain acquisitions, automobile / pedestrian traffic disruptions, etc.
- Ridership estimates
- Objective pros and cons analysis of this proposed expansion

Prior to any public meetings, this and any other pertinent information should be made available to the public in an advertised, easily accessible location, for example the http://www.sdmts.com/Trolley web site.

Regards,

Sam Burroughs
To whom it may concern:

Please do not route a trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from further consideration in the environmental study.

I enjoy hiking in Rose Canyon at least once a week. Placing a trolley route in Rose Canyon would ruin the experience for me by making it visually unappealing, and a noisy experience that further degrades the quality of a peaceful and restful area of our community.

--Robert Byrnes
4018 Nobel Drive #305
San Diego, CA 92122
(858) 623-9756
Dear Leaders,
RE: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the LRT 3 (three) alternative
My TWO major concerns:
1. Significant ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS on valuable, precious Rose Canyon natural resource
2. Negative impact on EDUCATION opportunities

My background-SD County Native (57 yrs)
- Volunteer for environmental protection (25 yrs)- Penasquitos Canyon & public lands
- Public school teacher (30 yrs) ----- leader of our SD Children & Nature movement
(Richard Louv) ----- Education Coordinator for SD Audubon

1) Significant ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS through Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve!!!!! These impacts are unmitigable.
A. Diverse habitats & wildlife will be impacted: This incredible park with healthy and diverse threatened habitats of coastal sage scrub, chaparral, oak/sycamore woodland riparian area is home to a huge diversity of wildlife (ie 99 species of birds). Having a trolley go through this increasingly valuable resource in NOT COMPATIBLE land use.
B. Noise pollution will impact the wildlife and human life.
C. The visual impact of poles, overhead wires, and big retaining walls will destroy the aesthetics of the natural view and beauty.
Experience in Rose Canyon Open Space preserve:
As an environmental education teacher I have led 15 field trips for science standards for elem. school students (K - 7th from Curie & Spreckels Elem Schools). I administer the SD Audubon after school program called OutdoorExplore! (We have lead a total of students on four 1 1/2 hr hikes each Fall & Spring season.

n (2007 to present), our SD Children & Nature Collaborative is working with Friends of Rose Canyon to help more families to go hiking, help more schools do Nearby Nature School Field Trips, through county wide schools guidebook (funded by a grant from Sempra Education),
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Ladies and Gentlemen

Before commenting I should make it clear that although you may associate me with the Clairemont Community Planning Group, the AIA Urban Design Committee or the San Diego Council of Design Professionals I am not representing any of these groups in these observations.

Background
I am a forty year resident of Clairemont. I attended a SANDAG/MTS presentation on May 18th to the Clairemont Community Planning Group of which I am a member. Based on the information presented at that meeting I have the following comments:

Clairemont Ridership
The ridership projections were very conclusive that light rail is the appropriate vehicle to serve UTC and UCSD. I assume the projections were not based on significant ridership from the three stops in Clairemont. Unless there is assurance of a shuttle to serve the community, Clairemont’s transportation tax dollars being spent on the extension are not appropriately serving the community.

Trolley Stop Parking
Because of the low density in the community, few residents will be close enough to the stops to walk there. Current design shows inadequate parking at all three stops. I understand that re-development at the foot of Balboa Ave. would create a park and ride lot. There is redevelopment opportunity at the Tecolote/Sea World Stop as well. There currently is inadequate parking at both locations. The proposal to parallel park on the west side of Morena Blvd to support the Clairemont Drive stop seems inadequate. The rush hour 5 minute queue from Clairemont Drive to north bound Interstate 5 would alone exceed the potential parking on Morena Blvd. Parking in the adjacent Mission Bay lots would be problematic because of the very narrow side walk on the connecting bridge. Overflow parking in the new Bay View Plaza Shopping Center would be problematic as well.

Automobile alternative
Clairemont is predominantly a low density suburban neighborhood. For most residents a job in the employment centers of UTC, UCSD and Downtown is a 15 to 20 minute ride. It will be difficult to get people to drive to a transit station and transfer to public transportation when the resulting commute is extended rather than
shortened unless shuttle service is provided as part of the project. Providing a way to get people on public transportation without using their cars would be the better solution.

**Super Loop bus feeder**
The Clairemont Community Planning Group developed a Vision Plan to augment the out of date Clairemont Community Plan. In the Vision Plan we envisioned a “Super Loop” bus route on such streets as Clairemont Drive, Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Convoy Street, Genesee Avenue and Balboa Ave. Growth would be encouraged along this route to support students, elderly, and families. The loop would feed into the light rail trolley system. This would preserve the desired low density character of the existing neighborhoods and better support a viable public transportation system.

In summary, there needs to be a coordinated effort to integrate bus and trolley service as well as redevelopment at both the Tecolote and Balboa Stops. Without these elements very few residents of Clairemont would benefit from this very expensive development.

Jack Carpenter FAIA  
Architects MDWF  
4206 W. Pt. Loma Blvd., Ste. 200  
San Diego, CA 92110  
619.223.2400; 619.223.3017 fax
Attachment: Community Vision Statement

Draft

Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee

Taskforce for a New Community Planning Vision

15 October 2008

The following is a summary of comments and suggestions developed by the members of the Visioning Task Force. The Task Force composed of several Committee members who met several times in open meetings to develop a strategy that the CMPC could consider for adoption as guidelines in the absence of a badly needed updated Clairemont Community Plan. The ideas are strictly suggestions to the CMPC and are not intended to be adopted without thorough discussion and Committee Vote. Further any ideas should be reviewed by our City Planning Representatives before they are implemented.

**Transportation/Mobility**

Major transportation corridors including Clairemont Drive, Clairemont Mesa Blvd, Balboa Avenue and Mt. Acadia were not intended to receive the high volume of traffic they are experiencing. Clairemont Drive passes in front of housing duplexes and single-family residences. This creates a safety hazard for the children associated with those homes. Balboa doubles as an artillery highway and a high traffic-shopping street. Mt Acadia, a two-lane street is a major collector that passes several pedestrian sensitive activities including churches, schools, ball fields, retail and single-family residences. Several stop signs have been added to this street to act as a Band-Aid to the traffic problem.

Alternate routes to collector streets have been used to avoid congestion. An example is Cowley Way, which parallels the, rush hour, congested Clairemont Drive. Several of these alternative routes have added speed bumps and stop signs. This was a desperate means to control the intrusion of increased traffic.

The collectors were intended to be in canyons. Fortunately the canyons have been protected but this has impacted many of the major streets.

Public transportation is crippled since the frequency and destinations do not efficiently serve the community. Jobs have moved away from the Cities' concentrated old industrial/commercial core. The new centers of employment are scattered across the North City/County with very fragmented bus service.
Most existing routes run North and South intending to serve the major employment/education centers.

Traffic along Balboa is both community and non-community based. The through traffic was intended to be diverted to Highway 52 for non-community vehicles. This has not happened. The associated strip commercial development further erodes the ability to promote neighborhood and community identity. See the Balboa Ave Plan for specifics of the needed changes.

We recommend the CMPC consider an inner community shuttle loop using the major collector streets to provide access to neighborhood resources for community members including students and the elderly. This could also serve as a collector for the future Trolley station at the foot of Balboa. Further this would allow the relocation of housing along those shuttle routes to accommodate the residents that are dependent on public transportation and promote future high frequency public transportation. See the housing portion of the report for details on recommended restrictions on multifamily housing.

**Pedestrian/Bicycle access and circulation**

(To be provided by special taskforce)

**Urban Design**

There needs to be better community identity. A better “sense of place”. Participation in the Cities Fine Arts Master Plan should be encouraged. Walkable neighborhoods as defined in the current Community Plan should continue to be a priority.

**Public facilities**

The communities’ infrastructure needs significant repair and improvements. Aging fire stations and libraries are a case in point. Some of these improvements could be tied to future development. An example was the potential of trading an on site library at Clairemont Village for the residential developable land at the current adjacent library site.

Future growth must be tied to adequate utility infrastructure.

Better coordination needs to be encouraged between the City and the City Schools Planning.

**Recreation/Open Space**

Clairemont’s System, of Canyons including Rose, Marian Bear and Tecolote Canyons are important community assets that must continue to be protected. While the potential to relocate the utilities out of the canyon is probably a long way off due to the attended cost,
we need to minimize the impact on the canyons due to continuing repairs. We should defer our comments regarding Tecolote Canyon to the Canyon’s Planning Committee. Nonetheless they should be encouraged to review and incorporate the award winning Canyon Lands proposal.

**Conservation**

Not Discussed except as identified above

**Noise**

Not discussed

**Historic Preservation**

Clairemont needs to celebrate its past to encourage community identity. This includes the historic churches such as Pioneer, St Marks and others. The old dairy and the revenuer’s station in Bay Park and the old army camp at Balboa and Genesee. Plaques, monuments and descriptions help to build pride in the community.

**Housing**

The City’s goal of community growth over the next twenty years appears to be easily accommodated by the current community accepted plans, specifically along Morena Boulevard and adjacent to Clairemont Village.

The City of Villages outlined in the Specific Framework Plan is a worthy goal but without adequate infrastructure it is impractical in Clairemont for the foreseeable future. Specific areas of concern include the lack of effective public transportation, poor collector streets and adequate public utilities.

Higher Density housing could be accommodated adjacent to major Freeways where access, public transportation and utilities are more available. If such sites were large enough, a Village concept could be accommodated. An example of a potential small viable village would be the shopping area along Morena Boulevard in Bay Park.

There is a large area of duplex development that could be redeveloped at a slightly higher density but affording more open space at a decreased floor area ratio.

Senior housing, especially along transportation corridors, should be encouraged. Special regulations regarding reduced area per unit and parking will work only if the City can maintain the senior-only occupancy.
Tandem parking should not be allowed until such time that public transportation is adequate enough to insure the occupants will not, out of frustration, park one car on the street further exacerbating street parking congestion.

High density mixed-use conversion of existing shopping centers should be discouraged unless adequate access as described above, problems of immediate neighbor shading and impacts are addressed as well.

Companion Units (Granny Flats), if structured properly, could be a great asset to Clairemont. It would allow seniors to remain in their homes by subletting the primary or secondary residence. It would allow seniors or children to live with their families in a semi independent environment. It could be a simple way to create affordable housing and help to relieve pressure on demand for increased density. That said. There needs to be restrictions as to the size of the units and onsite parking. The current City of San Diego requirements are too restrictive, requiring oversized lots to consider a companion unit.

In general, Clairemont should maintain its single family, low density character but allow growth along major corridors where seniors, the disabled and youth could access public facilities via improved public transportation. By allowing controlled growth along these corridors, we can resist external pressure for growth in undesirable areas while accommodating the needs of our citizens.

**Land Use**

Both commercial office and industrial uses should be encouraged in Clairemont. The more people who live and work in our community the lesser the impact on our infrastructure particularly traffic congestion. That said there is considerable industrial areas at the north and north east portion of our community. Heavy industry in unlikely and should be discouraged as the citizenry wishes to protect it’s bedroom community environment. Light industry and in particularly research (R and D) related industry should be encouraged. Several corridors are suitable for office and or research. Of particular note is the Morena Boulevard corridor adjacent to Interstate 5. Any office or research facility should be located near freeways to preclude out of community employees from having to traverse our already congested streets.

As Clairemont becomes more diverse, the neighborhood school concept should be reinforced. As the City meets its integration mandates magnet schools should return to neighborhood schools to reduce bussing cost and to reinforce the children’s sense of community.
Ladies and Gentlemen

Before commenting I should make it clear that although you may associate me with the Clairemont Community Planning Group, the AIA Urban Design Committee or the San Diego Council of Design Professionals I am not representing any of these groups in these observations.

Background

I am a forty year resident of Clairemont. I attended a SANDAG/MTS presentation on May 18th to the Clairemont Community Planning Group of which I am a member. Based on the information presented at that meeting I have the following comments:

Clairemont Ridership

The ridership projections were very conclusive that light rail is the appropriate vehicle to serve UTC and UCSD. I assume the projections were not based on significant ridership from the three stops in Clairemont. Unless there is assurance of a shuttle to serve the community, Clairemont’s transportation tax dollars being spent on the extension are not appropriately serving the community.

Trolley Stop Parking

Because of the low density in the community, few residents will be close enough to the stops to walk there. Current design shows inadequate parking at all three stops. I understand that re-development at the foot of Balboa Ave. would create a park and ride lot. There is redevelopment opportunity at the Tecolote/Sea World Stop as well. There currently is inadequate parking at both locations. The proposal to parallel park on the west side of Morena Blvd to support the Clairemont Drive stop seems inadequate. The rush hour 5 minute queue from Clairemont Drive to north bound Interstate 5 would alone exceed the potential parking on Morena Blvd. Parking in the adjacent Mission Bay lots would be problematic because of the very narrow side walk on the connecting bridge. Overflow parking in the new Bay View Plaza Shopping Center would be problematic as well.

Automobile alternative

Clairemont is predominantly a low density suburban neighborhood. For most residents a job in the employment centers of UTC, UCSD and Downtown is a 15 to 20 minute ride. It will be difficult to get people to drive to a transit station and transfer to public transportation when the resulting commute is extended rather than shortened unless shuttle service is provided as part of the project. Providing a way to get people on public transportation without using their cars would be the better solution.

Super Loop bus feeder
The Clairemont Community Planning Group developed a Vision Plan to augment the out of date Clairemont Community Plan. In the Vision Plan we envisioned a “Super Loop” bus route on such streets as Clairemont Drive, Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Convoy Street, Genesee Avenue and Balboa Ave. Growth would be encouraged along this route to support students, elderly, and families. The loop would feed into the light rail trolley system. This would preserve the desired low density character of the existing neighborhoods and better support a viable public transportation system.

In summary, there needs to be a coordinated effort to integrate bus and trolley service as well as redevelopment at both the Tecolote and Balboa Stops. Without these elements very few residents of Clairemont would benefit from this very expensive development.
Hi,
I was going through my e-mail and found this. I do not have record of sending it on. Are we able to add it in?

Anne Howard Steinberger
Marketing Manager
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 699-1937
(619) 699-1905
Visit our Web site at www.sandag.org

From: Cynthia Castro [mailto:cynthia.ma.castro@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2010 9:38 AM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: Extension of the San Diego Trolley system to UCSD campus

Hello,

I am unable to attend tomorrow’s discussion concerning the extension of the San Diego Trolley system to UCSD campus, but wanted to express my interest in this issue. I just moved to San Diego from Oregon and the number one largest barrier for me truly loving life in San Diego is my daily commute—the traffic, congestion, safety concerns, and my contribution of greenhouse gases to the environment. Protecting the environment is incredibly important to me as I have two little kids and I want to preserve the quality of life here for them and future generations.

My husband and I are able to carpool most of the time, but even then I feel like he and I could be one less car on the road, and most of the vehicles I see commuting are single occupancy. I have dreamed of another option to take more cars off the road and feel like many people would jump on board if it meant better commutes and protecting the environment.

I am a proponent of public transportation, but unfortunately given our current system, I am unable to rely on public transportation. I live in Rancho Penasquitos, so I take the 56 W, then I-5 South, exit on Gennessee Avenue. The 56 W gets incredibly congested during peak commute hours (which unfortunately is when I have to commute). I am writing in support of the extension of the San Diego Trolley system, however, I do not know San Diego well enough to know if requesting a line that runs from PQ/Poway/Bernardo to UCSD and elsewhere is even realistic.

Thanks for providing the opportunity to share my thoughts.

-Cynthia Castro
I'm writing about the SANDAG Trolley. San Diego needs more public transportation and I *strongly support* building the LRT 1 route that runs along I-5, as has already been endorsed.

I am strongly AGAINST the LRT 3 route that would run through Rose Canyon to Genesee.

I'm with the UCSD School of Medicine, and Rose Canyon provides me with a way to decompress, not to mention peace and quiet when I have a spare hour. To lose Rose Canyon would not only be an environmental tragedy, it would lower property values and degrade our quality of life.

The LRT 1 route is the right choice.

Regards,

Michael Caton
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Gary Chapman [gary.happychap@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 7:52 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

To Whom It May Concern:

I am utterly opposed to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. **I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.** Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. **We urgently need to preserve Rose Canyon as an oasis of open space within our urban area.** The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Gary Chapman
4145 Caminito Cassis
San Diego, CA 92122
619-306-1206
Hello,

Please refer to the 2001 Balboa segment FEIS on the SANDAG Web site and the station concept at Clairemont Drive is shown there. This is figure 2.4-22 of the 2001 FEIS. Please access the pdf at [http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/FEIS-VOL1.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/FEIS-VOL1.pdf) and go to pg 106 of the document for station concepts.

Thank you for attending the meeting.

Regards,

Anne

---

From: J e Christensen [mailto:jechris9@san.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 10:14 AM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: STATION DESIGN

I attended the briefing yesterday - to review the current concepts for the Clairemont station staff directed me to the website to see the current thinking on station design - I can not find it. Can you please direct me to those plans?

Thank you
Jon Christensen
jechris9@san.rr.com
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Joan Christiansen [joancmft@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 8:53 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Please do not allow the spoiling of Rose Canyon – our precious heritage. We, our children, our grandchildren deserve to keep this bit of nature in the midst of sprawling development.
Thank you.
Joan Christiansen,
3803 Camino Lindo
San Diego, CA 92122
Please vote in favor of the LRT 1 alternative route for the Trolley. This route touches more useful destinations than the other routes and looks like a real asset for the community.

Please vote against the LRT 3 alternative, which would destroy a large part of one of the irreplaceable wild places in our city.

- Margaret Clark
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Karen Coleman

5568 Renaissance Ave. #2

San Diego, CA 92122
--- Original Message ---

From: Garrison Cottrell [mailto:gary@cs.ucsd.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 12:19 PM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: planned extension of the trolley

Hi -

I find it really odd that there are NO stops in University City, or Clairemont which is where many people going to UCSD are going to be coming from.

Couldn't there be a stop at Jutland Dr. and at 52?

g.

Gary Cottrell 858-534-6640 F: 858-534-7029 Computer Science and Engineering 0404 IF USING FED EX INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LINE:
CSE Building, Room 4130
University of California San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive # 0404
La Jolla, Ca. 92037-0404

"Agrapefruit is a lemon that saw an opportunity and took advantage of it." - note written on a door in amsterdam on Lybaangracht strasse.

"Only connect!" -E.M. Forster

"I am awaiting the day when people remember the fact that discovery does not work by deciding what you want and then discovering it."
-David Mermin

Email: gary@ucsd.edu
Home page: http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/~gary/
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Lily Cowen

4025 Caminito Davila

San Diego, Ca 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Bob & Carol Crafts [rcrafts@cox.net]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 8:44 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear sirs,

A trolley in Rose Canyon? No Way.

San Diego county has already lost too much open space and builders just don't seem to get it. More houses means more traffic and less of the quality of life that makes San Diego desireable.

Don't take away more open space from the humans and wildlife that live here.

Carol Crafts
13030 birch Lane,
Poway, CA 92064
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Meo O'Malley [meomal@san.rr.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 4:19 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

This is an email requesting that any trolley extension route continues north along I-5 to UCSD and NOT through Rose Canyon.

Thank You,
Bill Crane
3051 Pennant way
San Diego, CA. 92122
Dear Sir/Madam:

We are in favor of any trolley route along I-5 (LRT alternative 1 or 6) and opposed to the route through Rose Canyon (LRT alternative 3). In addition to devastating the Rose Canyon Open Space Park, which can't be emphasized enough, the routes along I-5 make much more sense:

1. We think that a primary source (if not the primary source) of trolley ridership will come from UCSD (specifically west campus). It makes sense to have a direct route from UCSD to points south, rather than having UCSD as the terminus.
2. The LRT 3 route uses a considerable amount of expensive below grade track under Genesee Ave. from Rose Canyon to UTC and after UTC under Executive Drive on its way to UCSD East Station.
3. The La Jolla Village Square Shopping Center, together with the adjacent "Shops at La Jolla Village" are becoming highly desired destinations in their own right, especially with the recent opening of Best Buy. LRT 3's terminus at UCSD West Station ignores these destinations due to its lack of the Nobel Drive station.
4. The Nobel Drive station is much closer to the apartment/condo housing east of I-5 and west of Regents Road. This station would be much more convenient than the UTC station for the ridership in that area.
5. The Nobel Drive station would also serve the apartment/condo housing west and south of the La Jolla Village Square. They would otherwise not have any direct access to the trolley.
6. The LRT 3 route does not add any critical stations that the other routes don't already have. Its main advantage is having a more direct link between the UTC Transit Center and points south. We think that this point is well mitigated by the above counterpoints.

Kim and I are both UCSD graduates and have been University City residents since 1976. Thank you for your consideration.

Ken & Kim Crocker
3919 Caminito Cassis
San Diego, CA 92122-1994
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Eve Demey [evedemey@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:34 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Native form Belgium I have now lived in UTC for 11 years.
ENOUGH of all those projects to destroy the Rose Canyon "Our sanctuary"!!!!!!!!!!! A Bridge a High Speed train and then what next

I oppose. Please do not turn UTC in more ugly concrete and noisy place.

Eve Demey
Stress Management center
(760)889-0403
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Doris Dickinson [dorisd33@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 10:46 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcountry.ca.gov

i oppose the route through Rose Canyon and the building of a bridge that is not needed
Doris dickinson
3956 Nobel Drive
San Diego, CA 92122
Opposition of trolley through Rose Canyon
Mary Anne Dilloway [obmad@mac.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 3:41 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Dilloway
save our canyons and open space
Yvonne Dows [ydows@cox.net]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 12:04 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

No trolley through rose canyon.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Dennis Doyle [ddoyle3@san.rr.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 9:28 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Today’s San Diego Union-Tribune featured Rose Canyon and the beautiful trails that run through this gorgeous, pristine area, recommending it as a hiking destination for the citizens of San Diego. We have so little open space in our city. Indeed, Rose Canyon serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife in the region. I have observed hawks, fox, owls, bobcats, raccoons and other amazing critters in this wildlife corridor. The city has committed to the conservation of Rose Canyon and to protecting its bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life. When I walk, run, or bike through the canyon I sometimes forget that I am in a large urban city. It is the one place nearby that I can escape to while reconnecting with nature. The proposed trolley route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3), however, would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, bringing with it additional ambient noise, visual pollution and significant environmental impacts: new tracks, poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and the disruption of frequent trolleys passing through the canyon.

I urge you, therefore, to please delete the proposed (LRT 3) routing of the trolley to an alternative route that would not impact Rose Canyon. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of Rose Canyon, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. My 15-year old twins have participated in these field trips and they have had wonderful experiences with nature first hand. For the sake of future generations, please delete LRT 3 from the trolley options.

Sincerely,

Dennis Doyle
3155 Galloway Dr.
San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Jon Eisen [jhe@joneisen.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 8:54 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Following is the form letter expressing my opposition to the proposed routing through Rose Canyon. But I want to express my own thoughts about the trolley route...

I know that if you build it, they will come...and more & more will come. And traffic will not be relieved for any lengthy time frame, as more quiet, family neighborhoods will be upset and turn into rentals as all but the most stubborn homeowners will move as the noise and traffic disrupts their lives.

In Phoenix, before we left for San Diego 20 years ago, they were in process of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to widen the interstate highways and streets, condemning properties where families had lived for decades so that Indian Casinos and strip malls could take over the space. – How did that improve quality of life? – It didn’t, unless your lobbyist was successful in taking privately owned land and garnering federally subsidized monies. It’s an endless cycle of Big Business Interests that care not a wit about the people in their way of more profits.

There are enough reasons to move from the financially bankrupt City of San Diego, and this may be the final nail in the coffin pushing my family (and others) to move to a nearby city that is managed with the general populace in mind, and not just the developers that have an outsized influence on decision making that effects thousands of other citizens.

Please re-consider your routing the trolley line through an undeveloped canyon, through established neighborhoods and route it along an existing roadway, like the I-5.

Regards,

JON EISEN

3275 Welmer Pl

San Diego, CA 92122
PS: I’m registered, as is everyone in my household of four, and we all vote.

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Jon Eisen, CFP
3275 Welmer Pl
San Diego, CA 92122

T: (858) 458-1448
To Whom It May Concern:

Even though I am now a resident of Chula Vista, I utilize San Diego's many open spaces, including Rose Canyon. In fact, while a resident of Golden Hill, I assisted in the preservation of the 32nd Street Canyon Open Space.

As you can imagine, I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,
Alexandra Epstein
617 3rd Ave #18
Chula Vista, CA 91910
To whom it may concern.

I strongly oppose the routing of the Trolley through Rose Canyon (route LRT-3). I am a local taxpayer and resident of over 30 years who lives on the east facing side of Mt Soledad and overlook the hillsides and route 5 below and to the north. I approve of mass transit (I'm from the UK originally) and would use the bus from my house down to PB if it were possible but the bus service on Mt Soledad was cancelled about 15 years ago. I realize lack of ridership is a problem - gas needs to be $10 a gallon as it is in the UK before we drivers will leave our cars.

I am concerned about the loss of more open space in the increasingly fragmented parks system. Increased traffic in new routes through open space means greater risk of fires. Utilizing Rose Canyon open space as a rail conduit provides great risk of increasing fires in densely built residential areas alongside and into connecting canyons during the dry season.

Increased mass transit benefits us but only if done intelligently with minimum impact on the natural resources and parks which are getting fewer in acreage. The preferred trolley alternative would be alongside an already utilized route - along I-5, LRT-1. I understand that there will be considerable mitigation required even with this route since there will be impacts to the west end of Rose Canyon open space as well as Marion Bear Park and to Rose Creek itself.

Increased loss of parkland will make San Diego an unattractive area for those taxpayers who stay in San Diego because of these natural areas.

Again, I urge the trolley alternative route LRT 1 route be used and NOT LRT 3 which will devastate the park use with noise, wires, grading - and probably increase the risk from fires in our increasingly frequent and lengthy fire seasons.

Sincerely,

Meryl Faulkner
5915 Desert View Dr
La Jolla Ca 92037
Dear Ms. Lightner and Mr. Roberts and all concerned,

As you consider the trolley proposals, please remember that San Diego is very deficient in providing open space parks for its citizens.

As with Balboa Park in San Diego, (or Central Park in New York), these open space resources will increase in value in the future.

Once these open spaces have been developed, they can not be replaced.

Please consider alternative route for the trolley!

Best Regards,

Jeff

Jeff Flowers
Chief Instigator
Wild at Work
6244 Ferris Square
San Diego, CA 92121

858-558-6890 x107
858-558-6902 FX

www.PerksCompany.com
www.WildatWork.com
I have been a resident of south University City for 18 years. I moved here because of the family neighborhood and peaceful environment. I hope that your upcoming decisions will not negatively affect this community.

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.

Sincerely,

Rev. Nancy Fowler
From: Everett DeLano [mailto:everettdelano@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 10:50 AM
To: Steinberger, Anne
Subject: comments re mid-coast project

Please see attached. Please call if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Everett DeLano

Law Offices of Everett L. DeLano III
220 W. Grand Avenue
Escondido, California 92025
(760) 510-1562
(760) 510-1565 (fax)

The information contained in this message may be legally privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to review the information contained herein and are requested to contact us and destroy the information. Thank you.
June 1, 2010

VIA E-MAIL & U.S. MAIL

Anne Steinberger
SANDAG
401 B. Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Dear SANDAG:

These comments are submitted on behalf of Friends of Rose Canyon in response to the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS/EIR”) for the proposed Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (“Project”).

The NOP identifies several “previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decisions for the Mid-Coast Corridor.” These documents, as well as the resolutions approving previous decisions, should be made available on SANDAG’s website.

And while the NOP discusses the need for “supplemental” environmental review, it is unclear just what SANDAG intends to “supplement.” This should be made clear in the EIS/EIR.

Also, a May 2010 “Scoping Information Brochure” issued by SANDAG claims that the “purpose and need for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project focuses on improving mobility and accessibility and attracting transit-supportive land uses and economic development to smart growth centers in the Mid-Coast Corridor.” This purpose and need should be defined clearly in the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, the EIS/EIR should provide a clear description and depiction of where these “smart growth centers” are to be located and how and when they will be developed.

In addition, the EIS/EIR should address the following issues:

- The scope of the Project;
- All phases of Project development, including other phases and sections of the transit system;
- Construction traffic impacts, including impacts associated with slow-moving and heavy equipment;
• Land use impacts, including existing General Plan and municipal code requirements and existing uses in the surrounding area;
• Traffic impacts, including impacts associated with inducing travel;
• Noise impacts to surrounding uses, including nearby neighborhoods, parks and habitat uses, and impacts associated with destruction of on-site vegetation;
• Light impacts to surrounding uses, including nearby neighborhoods, parks and habitat uses;
• Toxics and human health impacts, including impacts associated with construction and airborne contamination during construction;
• Water and air quality impacts, including impacts associated with existing on-site contamination;
• Water supply impacts;
• Historical and cultural resource impacts, including impacts associated with destruction of existing features on the Site;
• Cumulative impacts;
• Global Warming impacts;
• Adequate and verifiable mitigation for Project impacts;
• Consideration of mitigation that includes open space acquisition in and around Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Park; and
• An adequate range of alternatives, including alternatives that avoid parkland like Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Park, as well as a “no project” alternative that is consistent with existing uses and existing conditions in the Project vicinity.

Thank you for your consideration of the above. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or need additional information. Please ensure that I am provided a copy of the draft EIS/EIR and any notice regarding the Project.

Sincerely,

Everett DeLano
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Jim Fry
4046 Caminito Terviso
San Diego, CA 92122
I am in support of the LRT-1 route for the proposed trolley. It is the much more functional and environmentally sound route. I strongly oppose the LRT-3 route through Rose Canyon...it would devastate one of our few open spaces so enjoyed by families all over San Diego. We must protect this treasure. Thank you for your consideration.

Virginia Gainer
South University City
I am writing to encourage Sandag to support plans for the trolley that DO NOT go through Rose Canyon. I am a native San Diegan and have valued our canyons as one of San Diego's greatest assets. Growing up in Kensington, (old family home still owned there) I have long been opposed to building and other construction that jeopardizes this resource. Certainly the damage to Rose Canyon would be far reaching, forever damaging its beauty and potential as a true place left to "getaway" and enjoy nature within city limits.

We now reside in University City and frequent Rose Canyon almost daily.

Please route the trolley along existing freeways or other areas where environmental damage will be less or to areas already impacted.

Thank you,

Kathleen Wood Geckeler
3977 Camino Lindo
San Diego, Ca  92122

kathy
At the May 26, 2010 Genesee Highlands HOA Board of Directors meeting the board unanimously passed a resolution on behalf of the Genesee Highlands HOA in support of the trolley to UCSD and UTC but opposing the trolley line through Rose Canyon.

This resolution is consistent with the resolution passed November 18, 2009 on behalf of the association in support of the high speed train but opposing the high speed train tracks in Rose Canyon.

Genesee Highlands is a condominium community of 502 units sited on 65 acres on the northern edge of Rose Canyon immediately west of Genesee Avenue. Roughly a thousand people or more live in GHA.

Thank you,
Gerry Senda
President, Genesee Highlands HOA
858.455-0640
I'm writing to comment on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. First, as a UCSD employee and also a resident of the neighborhood around UCSD I want to voice my enthusiasm for the trolley extension. The transit project will give us much improved public transit access to downtown and to the rest of San Diego.

I want to comment briefly on what I perceive to be key considerations in evaluating the three options put forward for public scoping.

One concern at UCSD is that the trolley will split the campus, separating student residences and athletic fields located to the east of the tracks from everything else that is west of I-5 on the UCSD campus. This concern is most pertinent for Option 1 and is effectively avoided by Option 3.

A second concern is that in locations where the trolley travels at street level, it will make pedestrian and bicycle traffic substantially more dangerous. These concerns are especially pertinent for Option 1, which has the trolley traveling at grade along Voigt Drive, and this is a concern, because at present Voigt Drive serves as a major pedestrian/bicycle artery for campus. When I spoke to SANDAG representatives at the public scoping open house at UCSD, they indicated that they do not currently have bicycle transportation statistics for Voigt Drive. I believe that UCSD Transportation Services has made a thorough effort to gather these statistics, and they should be incorporated into the considerations. Many of these concerns could be avoided by elevating the trolley or displacing it relative to the road.

A third concern comes from trying to estimate timing between UCSD and downtown. Anyone who has lived in a city that is well served by a subway or light rail system knows that you count station stops as a quick way to estimate how long it will take to reach a destination. From that perspective, Option 3 places the UCSD campus at least 2 stations further away from downtown that would Option 1. At 3-5 minutes a station, those extra stops add up and could turn into a deterrent for potential trolley riders. From this perspective, Options 1 or 6 appear
to provide better connectivity between UCSD and destinations in Mission Valley and downtown that are out of bus range.

All of the routes have identifiable pros and cons, so I don't want to take a firm stance in favor of one route rather than another. But I do hope that in whatever route is finally developed, careful consideration is given to the routing of the trolley through the UCSD campus, that the route will avoid creating a bicycle and pedestrian safety problem on Voigt Drive, and that ridership timings between UCSD and Old Town/Mission Valley/downtown will be considered.

Best regards,

Sarah Gille
9551 Poole St.
La Jolla, CA  92037
To Whom It May Concern:

My husband and I would like to add our names to the list of those opposed to routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. We are looking forward to finally having the trolley in our neighborhood because we believe that good, accessible public transportation is very important. We realize that no matter what route is chosen there will be environmental impacts to be endured. We believe that LRT 1 route is the best alternative and would benefit more businesses to the north and east of the college. We love hiking in Rose and San Clemente Canyons and hate to see any more devastation than necessary.

As written by Friends of Rose Canyon:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

David and Lois Gottfredson

5953 Scripps Street
Save Rose Canyon for our children
j
oan goodwin [joangoodwin@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 10:14 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcoun
t.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.

We need open spaces for our kids. We enjoy hiking in Rose Canyon and have visited the canyon at the evening walks to learn about animals and plant life. Please keep the canyon alive and well for our local children.

I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Joan Green and family (Sajen age 7, Torrey age 5, Morgan age 3)
2725 Tokalon Street
Dear Policy Maker,

I am strongly opposed to routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. Instead, I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego -- like myself, my wife, and children -- use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, including my own, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

William Griswold
2769 Schenley Terrace
San Diego, CA  92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee  
The Hagstroms [thehags@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 8:23 AM  
To: midcoast@sandag.org  
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along 1-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Michele & Rick Hagstrom

2642 Lange Avenue

San Diego, CA  92122
I am a faculty member at UCSD, and I would like to express my support for the extension of the Trolley north, and through UCSD in particular. Our campus is unusual in the way it is isolated from the community of San Diego. I think it would be good for our students to have more ability to access other parts of the city, and to do so without having a car. In general, I think San Diego needs a lot more public transportation.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee  
Christine Harris [charris@ucsd.edu]  

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 1:05 PM  
To: midcoast@sandag.org  
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov  

To Whom It May Concern:  

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.  

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.  

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.  

On a personal level, my family uses the canyon for recreational activity almost every day. Having a trolley run through it would completely destroy the joy we get from walking or running there. There are so few open spaces left in San Diego. Please don’t destroy this one.  

Sincerely,  

Christine R. Harris, Ph.D.
Sirs and Madams,

I am absolutely opposed to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon. In addition to being an environmental disaster, it would cost a fortune to build and maintain (which we don't have), and would do very little to mitigate traffic. The best option is to run more buses (regular and/or trolley) from downtown/ Old Town to UCSD. Currently, the only option is the 105 bus, which runs all through the city and takes 1.5 hours.

Buses running through UCSD, La Jolla Village and UTC, to Old Town and/or downtown would solve the problem and cost almost nothing.

This would not involve environmental impact studies, lawsuits or anything else.

The job of Government is to find the most common sense solutions to problems, not to take the path of MOST resistance to try to build monuments.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions, (that does not mean sending campaign literature).

Sincerely,

Brian Hassler
2912 Fried Ave.
San Diego, Ca, 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
JanHawkins [jancraven@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 9:53 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

When considering the trolley extension to UCSD, please support LRT-1 and DROP LRT-3. LRT-1 is not only the most useful route, accessing the most people, but we must preserve Rose Canyon.

Jan Hawkins
3233 Wellesly AVe.
SD 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Jim and Sue H.

University City
Hi Susanne:

A Mid-Coast newsletter request and question.

Thanks!

Katie Lemmon
Planning Assistant I

CityWorks
427 C Street Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92101
T 619 238-9091 X106
F 619 238-6042
E klemmon@cityworks.biz
cityworks.biz

------ Forwarded Message
From: <alexhempton@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, 13 May 2010 15:59:00 -0700
To: <klemmon@cityworks.biz>
Conversation: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com
Subject: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com

Name: Alex Hempton
e-mail: alexhempton@gmail.com

Subject: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com

Subscribe to Midcoast newsletter: on
Question: I support the idea of extending the trolley along the mid-coast to UTC and UCSD, however I question whether the current technology used to run the trolley is fast enough. While the trolley might be well-suited for downtown San Diego, on longer distances from Downtown to UTC/UCSD or Downtown to the Mexico border, a faster train, like a Metro (Washington DC) or BART (San Francisco) seems like it would be better suited for a longer haul.

------ End of Forwarded Message
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
louise [Ineelan@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:57 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Louise Hofheimer

3069 Renault St

San Diego, CA 92122
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.

I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,
Louise Hofheimer
3069 Renault St.
San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Judy Hood [judyhood@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 11:41 AM  
To: midcoast@sandag.org  
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To All To Whom This May Concern:

I have lived on Tony Drive, near Rose Canyon, for 41 years. My children and grandchildren have hiked and played in Rose Canyon, since we moved here in 1969. We like Rose Canyon the way it is, and so do the animals who live there. Over these many years, there have been a lot of changes here, as is true everywhere. We used to have coyotes, and could hear them howling at each other. We haven't heard coyotes for a long time, maybe 20 years. Our neighbors on Radcliffe remember when bobcats roamed and drank from their swimming pool. Now we have this narrow stretch of canyon left that is somewhat as it has been for these past 41 years. A lot of people enjoy its semi-pristine natural beauty and hike in it. Please leave it the way it is now.

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life. Again, please leave Rose Canyon the way it is now.

Sincerely,

Judith M. Hood  
3416 Tony Drive  
San Diego, CA 92122
Yes, I am all for extending the trolley from Old Town to University City.

Kelly Houston
4121 Calgary Ave. University City, Ca. 92122
-outbound scanned
PLEASE build the TROLLEY for UNIVERSITY CITY~!
Tanya HoweAeria [tanya.aeria@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 9:36 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org; SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

We need some public transportation up here in University City. I would love to take more public transportation, but it just does not exist in University City. I live at the far EAST END of UC (by the 805 FWY) and have to walk over 1 1/2 miles to get to the nearest bus. There is a senior home center in my community that has NO bus access either.

I have two small children who will someday be relying on our public transit system. I welcome all the building of rapid transit, public transit and high speed rail systems! Please build us a decent public transit system!

--
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Andrea and Carl
5864 Carnegie Street
San Diego, CA 92122

--
Andrea Ito, MA
Resource Teacher
Curriculum, Assessment, & Instructional Design
Instructional Support Services Division
619 725-7354
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Farokh Jamalyaria [farokhj@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 3:47 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,
Farokh Jamalyaria, MD
Ariane Jansma [ajansma@scripps.edu]

Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 8:33 AM
To: lbl@sandag.org; midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; ron-roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing this email to voice my strong opposition to routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I ask that you remove this route from any further consideration in the environmental study and instead focus efforts on LRT 1. The LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD would be very useful for the community and would not have near the devastating impact on Rose Canyon Open Space Park.

The LRT 3 route would destroy Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with ridiculous noise, environmental impacts from new tracks, poles, wires, grading, retaining walls and frequent trolleys. Our community values Rose Canyon Open Space Park as a fantastic resource in terms of education for our local schools and through our own use via hiking, biking, jogging, etc. My family and I hike this canyon regularly and as a community we believe it needs to be protected.

LRT 1 route is a good solution for the trolley and minimizes the extreme environmental impact the other route would cause.

Thank you,

Ariane

--
Ariane Jansma, Ph.D.
Wright/Dyson Laboratory
The Scripps Research Institute
10550 N. Torrey Pines Rd., MB-2
La Jolla, CA 92037
(858) 784-9726
Mail to: ajansma@scripps.edu
Dear Trolley Extension Supporters,

I am a northwest Clairemont resident, and I am delighted to see that the Trolley will be extended to Clairemont and La Jolla. However, I do not support sending the trolley through our favorite green belt, Rose Canyon. A more direct route straight up to UCSD is far preferable, due to the environmental impacts of the trolley and the greater simplicity of having the trolley go straight where you want it to go. I would also like, however, to see my own neighborhood served. I notice that the trolley would completely skip a stop in North Clairemont, with stops only at Balboa and Clairemont Drive. For the trolley to be truly useful, it should also stop at the end of Jutland, thus serving the NOrth Clairemont areas as well as the south. I hope you will consider sending the trolley straight up I-5, instead of detouring through Rose Canyon, and will consider adding a stop at the end of Jutland Drive, serving the community of North Clairemont.

thank you!

Cynthia Jenson-Elliott
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Amos H. Jessup [amos@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 2:24 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

It is mad, and certainly anti-social, to even consider the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). Delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study!

For lack of anything better, support the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.

But note that even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys.

Why would you want to contribute to the decimation and ruination of one of the few natural areas left in San Diego? Why??

People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region's quality of life.

Sincerely,

Amos H. Jessup
University City
92122

--

CONFORMITY
Conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth.

John F. Kennedy
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Daly Jessup [jessup@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 2:07 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

The route through Rose Canyon is the most destructive of all the proposed alternatives. Please find a route that does not require building tracks and poles and overhead wires through this natural park. Obviously, there is no solution that is completely free of undesirable consequences, but the Rose Canyon solution is the most destructive and disruptive of all the alternatives. I-5 has already disrupted a great deal of that land, and so a bit more is less of a shock to the environment than the other alternatives.

The stops available will also be more useful to more of the population, as far as I can see. Please take Rose Canyon off the list of alternatives. San Diego is, bit by bit, losing its areas of beauty. Please don't add another victim to the list.

Daly Jessup
------------------
To whom it may concern:

Kindly note, that we the undersigned appose the routing of the trolley line through Rose Canyon and request that this option be dropped.

We are of the opinion that the alternative route through the I-5 corridor will have a less damaging environmental impact.

Sincerely,

Les Kacev
Glenda Kacev
Benji Kacev
David Kacev
3242 Lahitte Ct, san Diego, CA 92122

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you believe that you have received this email in error, please contact the sender.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Stephen Keane [skeane@femtapharma.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 8:48 AM
To:   midcoast@sandag.org
Cc:   Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Roberts,

I would like you to know that I believe any further effort to build this completely destructive bridge in the University City Neighborhood is fool hardy.

Please continue to focus your attentions on more pressing matters of the city – like balancing the budget, water supply issues and education!

I pay the city property taxes that exceed $20,000 per year as well as taxes for the business that I run and hope that as concerned tax payer you at least get the opportunity to read this note and understand how development of an unnecessary bridge would ruin one of the coolest communities in the city. Quality of life for a community that was built in 1963 is important to be preserved and 17,000 cars racing through it would certainly ruin that quality of life.

Thank you all for your understanding and please continue to represent taxpayers – not builders who come and go and do not have to live where they build!

Stephen Keane
President and Chief Operating Officer

4510 Executive Drive, Suite 322
San Diego, California 92121
Office: 858 - 622 - 0424
Cell: 858 - 232 - 5928
skeane@femtapharma.com
www.femtapharma.com
I like the ideas for the service, especially any of the ones that go up Gilman and through UCSD -- in the meantime, why not run an all-day frequent bus route along the corridor, including the very underserved Pacific Beach to University City corridor, which right now requires an hour to go through downtown La Jolla, or three routes with uncoordinated transfers.
To Whom It May Concern:

We strongly oppose to a trolley being routed through Rose Canyon. We have been residents of University City since 1968. Our children, and now our grandchildren have enjoyed using the trails in this park for hiking as well as biking. We have enjoyed the natural look and peacefulness of this area. There are so many wonderful plants and animals that use this canyon for their home. Where would they go? I'm certain that they would not be welcomed on the trolley to find another location. Please consider all of the children from the surrounding schools that, over the years, have enjoyed the advantage of having this wonderful area to help them learn about wildlife. There are so few places left in residential areas that have this distinction. Please save ours! Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gary and Ida Keller
5572 Stresemann St.
San Diego, CA. 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Kristin David Kistler [kdavid@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 7:17 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov
Attachments: To Whom It May Concern.docx (11 KB)

Please see my attached letter opposing the trolley through Rose Canyon.

Sincerely,

Kristin David Kistler, PhD
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Kristin Kistler, PhD

3250 Millikin ave

San Diego, CA

92122
Trolley Route through Rose Canyon
Laura Kligman [lklig@earthlink.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 3:40 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to you to express my most strident opposition to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon.

This proposed route would devastate Rose Canyon, one of the few remaining nature preserves we have in San Diego. More specifically, this proposed route would severely (and negatively) impact the quality of life that my family and I enjoy in a neighborhood that abuts Rose Canyon. The noise and pollution associated with this train would be unbearable. We would no longer be able to take our children and dog into or near the canyon. Simply sitting in our own backyard and enjoying the peace and solitude that we are currently afforded would no longer be possible.

I implore you to no longer consider LRT 3 as a viable option for the trolley and to pursue other, less destructive options.

Thank you,
Laura Kligman
3238 Millikin Avenue
To Whom It May Concern:

As a UCSD employee and UC resident, I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study and to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

MaryAnn Klima
Contracts & Grants Specialist
Business Office, Dept. of Ophthalmology
mklima@ucsd.edu

Residence:
5672 Carnegie St.
San Diego, CA  92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
christianne knoop [kikiknoop@cox.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 12:15 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Please find an alternative route for the trolley. It does not belong in Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is a special place that should be nurtured and preserved as it is not only host to many different animal species, that depend on it's undisturbed existence, it is also a beautiful place for humans to enjoy as well. We have so few of these relatively untouched areas, we must protect the ones we have.

Thank you,
Christanne Knoop
3092 C Street
San Diego, CA 92102
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Appraise All - Bryan Knowlton [bryanknowlton@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 12:20 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org; sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov; rosecanyon@san.rr.com

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Bryan Knowlton
4301 Vallejo Ave
San Diego, CA 92117
858-232-3348

--
Save time - order online at http://www.appraiseallrealestate.com

Appraise All
4809 Clairemont Dr #208, San Diego, CA 92117
858-232-3348

We accept Visa, Mastercard, Cash or Money Order

Please visit YELP and review my appraisal services!!! It would really help me out!
http://www.yelp.com/biz/appraise-all-real-estate-la-jolla
Oppose trolley route
Elle Dang [elledang@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 3:55 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.

Please select instead the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.

Thank you,

L. Kotenko

3466 Millikin Ave, 92122
One question/comment: why aren't you hooking the trolley extension north to hook up with the Sorrento Valley train station? That way UCSD employees, many of whom live in North County, could take the Coaster to Sorrento Valley and then change to the trolley to go to campus. The current bus shuttle system is a real inhibitor for UCSD employees to use the Coaster--uncomfortable and inconvenient. If the trolley connected Sorrento Valley and the campus, however, I might very well start using them to commute to work. Why no extension to the Coaster station?
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Henry Krous [hkrous@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:13 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Henry F. Krous, MD
4215 Caminito Cassis
San Diego, CA 92122-1978
I'm 100% behind the LRT1 plan. More people would take the trolley than the other alternatives, the only thing I would change is add a station at the VA hospital. When I went to the scoping meeting, lots of people were lamenting its absence from the plan. Is it being considered?

-David
i've written an email in support of LRT 1, but wish to add that I'm adamantly opposed to LRT 3, which goes through Rose Canyon needlessly. I wish that the project has as little impact on the canyon as possible.

-David Krysl
North University City
To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

First, I concur with the SANDAG Board’s recommendations to pursue further detailed environmental and engineering study of Alternatives LRT 1 and 6 with LRT 1 being the preferred alignment.

Second, I strongly urge the Board to abandon Alternative LRT 3. The environmental consequences of this alignment; the huge local opposition that has already been mounted against this alternative; the undesirability of a dramatically below-grade station at UTC; and, the loss of the Nobel Drive Station combine to make this alternative totally unacceptable. Please don’t waste precious resources including the huge human capital that will mobilize to oppose this alternative; eliminate this alternative now.

Third, I request that evaluation of the Balboa Station includes a full transit station on the order of the Old Town Station with accommodations for transit, kiss-n-ride, and a parking garage. Further the evaluation should examine reworking the local streets to optimize automobile access to the garage from Pacific Beach, La Jolla, Clairemont, and Morena. Until we realize the full build-out of the regional transportation plan this station offers the best opportunity for those communities to access the trolley system.

Fourth, it is imperative that both the Nobel Drive Station and the UTC Station also include a parking garage as well as local street improvements as may be needed to accommodate vehicular and bicycle access from the surrounding multi-family (Villa La Jolla, La Jolla Colony, Golden Triangle) and single family (University City South) neighborhoods. The UTC Station is a unique opportunity for residents of University City South to easily access the trolley system.

Fifth, the Tecolote and Clairemont Stations should be evaluated and engineered as gateways to the beach communities and recreational opportunities of Mission Bay, Mission Beach, and Pacific Beach. This should include pedestrian/bicycle access over Interstate 5 (not Clairemont Drive), transit connections, summer shuttle service, etc.

Regards,
Joe

--
Joe LaCava
5274 La Jolla Boulevard
La Jolla, CA 92037
858.488.0160
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Stephen Lachmayr [lachmayr@qualcomm.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:37 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org; sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I understand the need for this important public transportation extension. However, I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to instead select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Stephen Lachmayr
4942 Mount Etna Drive
San Diego, CA 92117
Dear Sandag members,
I am absolutely in favor of public transportation, but oppose routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3).

I believe the best trolley alternative is the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD, as long as the environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek are mitigated.

We cycle at least once a week along Rose Canyon and are among the many local residents who treasure this remnant of nature in the city.

I hope you are responsive to our concerns.

Sincerely
Judith Landau
5989 Agee Street, SD 92122
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Don Lander
4049 Caminito Terviso
San Diego, CA 92122
858-551-4092

http://www.eset.com
Hi Mark,

It was great meeting you at the recent scoping meetings for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. At the last meeting I talked to you about the need for a station to capture southbound traffic from I-5. I have written up my thoughts and included them below as well as in an attachment. I have also attached two pdf files. The first of these shows possible routes between UCSD west an UTC. The second shows routes from UCSD down to Sorrento Valley. I don't have info on how steep trolley grades can be, so I tried to keep them in the 2-3 % range. At that the mapping is a rough estimate of where route could go.

Please let me know if you have any questions about these ideas,

Rob

The Need for a Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project LRT Station on Genesee at I-5

Need for a Station on Genesee west of I-5

As I review the LRT options for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, none of them provide a station designed to capture southbound traffic from I-5 for the transfer to rail. I believe that this will result in the system failing to move this traffic from the freeway to the Trolley. Therefore I would like to suggest the consideration of a station to be located where Genesee crosses a major canyon west of I-5.

A station at this location could service buses coming up from Sorrento Valley and Torrey Pines Mesa as well as traffic coming south on I-5. It would probably require another bridge or tunnel to cross Genesee to service the parking garage and bus turn around. The parking garage should be located up canyon from (South of) Genesee. The access to I-5 north from eastbound Genesee may have to be relocated, as the current traffic load is maxing out the current configuration of lights and ramps.
Route Change to Serve Station West of I-5

To get to this new station from the current LRT Alternative number one route, a tunnel would need to be built from the UCSD West station north under Voigt Drive and the Canyon View Pool Complex to the canyon north of this complex. This canyon could be followed to a potential station where the canyon crosses Genesee. Here the LRT would turn east and follow Genesee to the University Town Center Transit Center.

Sorrento Valley and High Speed Rail Concerns for route location

When designing the route from the UCSD West Station north, the grade through the tunnel under Voigt should be planned to provide the Trolley a steady grade to eventual continue down to Sorrento Valley to connect with the Coaster and Amtrak (or the High Speed Rail). With this route planned, then the route for the Genesee line should be planned to branch off it. It could either branch where the line to Sorrento Valley comes out of the tunnel under Voigt or it could branch where that line would cross Genesee as it descends to Sorrento.

On the attached map I have shown two routes for the Sorrento Line. The Green line drops more steeply and has to tunnel under Genesee and I-5 to get to the current Coaster Station. The Black line takes a slightly more gradual grade and stays above Genesee and the I-5 onramp. But it has to curve west away from I-5 to be able to descend into Sorrento Valley and then it curves back to the Coaster station.

On the attached maps I have drawn two different versions of the UCSD to UTC route. The Purple Line branches at the north end of the tunnel under Voigt and stays high to be able to stay above Genesee from I-5 east. While this makes for a flatter grade, it stays too high above the Genesee Station location and would not allow a good connection for trains between UTC and Sorrento. In contrast, the Red Line descends on the grade for the lines to Sorrento Valley. Here a Yellow line shows how a “Y” could connect the line from UTC to Sorrento. From this point the Red Line climbs across Canyon Point and then south to Genesee and follows the other alternates to UTC. Because the Red Line comes down to a level just above Genesee, it makes it easier to access from Genesee at the canyon. But it may be a challenge to find way for it to climb back up to Genesee at Canyon Point Drive.

Some have asked why we shouldn’t construct the extension to Sorrento Valley now. The reason is that the plans for the High Speed Rail route have yet to be decided. Any construction of a trolley route at this time might conflict with the eventual right-of-way for a High Speed Rail tunnel from just north of Balboa Avenue to somewhere in Sorrento Valley and any trolley stations placed there now might not produce the best transfers to and from the future High Speed Station. Therefore an extension north of Genesee to Sorrento Valley should wait until decisions are finalized for the High Speed Rail route and an eventual Balboa to Sorrento Tunnel is built.

The location which makes the most sense for the High Speed Rail/Coaster Station is in
the west end of Sorrento Valley just east of the intersection of Carmel Mountain Road and Sorrento Valley Road. The Carmel Mountain exit from the I-5 bypass lanes is only a block from this intersection. Traffic coming north on I-805 or I-5 or south on I-5 or west on Highway 56 all can easily reach this exit. Thus a station here could service people from Poway west and from I-8 north. Therefore it would make an excellent location for a transit center in the northern portion of the City of San Diego with transfers to longer distance rail.

(It should be noted that one can currently leave the Sorrento Station after the southbound Amtrak train goes through, drive at 65 mph to Santa Fe Street, just north of Balboa and have to wait 8-12 minutes for the train to sail past. So a tunnel from just north of Balboa to Sorrento could cut at least 10 minutes off the travel time to Los Angeles.)

When the line is eventually extended north to Sorrento Valley it could have one stop near the current Coaster Station and another in the west end of the valley at the High Speed Rail Station. Beyond this station a fleet of feeder buses make more sense than a LRT extension.

Genesee Line after the Sorrento Valley extension is built

Some have suggested that building alternative number three would make more sense if the line is to be extended to Sorrento Valley. But that route is too circuitous. By building alternative one and then extending it to Sorrento Valley a more direct route is produced. This is likely to attract more riders. But this could leave the Genesee line as a stub branch line.

If we look at the possibility of extending the Genesee line to the Torrey Pines Golf Course with stops at the Science Center Drive, General Atomic, Scripps Green and the Hilton there are clearly problems. Genesee is too steep for rails to follow it west. So this line would need climb north around Ligand Pharmaceuticals; then west around the north side of General Atomic to reach North Torrey pines near Scripps Green. Then it could continue north to the Hilton and the Inn at Torrey Pines. But even this route seems to be too steep. Also this area currently will only generate traffic during rush hours. So it is probably best left to bus and shuttle services.

With a “Y” at the junction with the line between UCSD and Sorrento, the west end of the Genesee line could carry traffic to the High Speed Rail station in Sorrento.

At its east end the line could be extended southeast from the UTC parking lot along Nobel on a descent to the current Amtrak/Coaster line in Rose Canyon. With those trains moved to a Balboa to Sorrento Tunnel, this line should be free to be used by the Trolley to go east to Miramar to service that area. Or it could loop around the north end of the west parking at UTC and follow the mesa east to Miramar.
Walk-to Traffic Concerns

Some have expressed a concern that there would be no places within walking distance of this stop that would generate traffic. But it would only be about 2 blocks from establishments on Science Center Drive and about the same distance from the Scripps Hospital’s Emergency Reception Room. While these would not generate great volumes of traffic, they would augment those arriving via bus and car. Sidewalks are needed to encourage this walk in traffic.

Drive-to Traffic Concerns

Until a station is developed near the Carmel Mountain Road/Sorrento Valley Road intersection, this would be the station to capture all traffic from the Del Mar Heights/Carmel Valley and northern areas. Even when the High Speed Rail Station is built, this station would capture traffic going to and from the Torrey Pines Mesa area.

To capture the Drive-to traffic, parking is required. The Purple line is so far above Genesee, west of I-5, that some sort of road would be needed to bring vehicles up to the flat where the UCSD agriculture field is located. The Red line is near enough Genesee that parking could be constructed on either side of that road. While there is a nice flat on the Northwest side of the Genesee/I-5 intersection, access to it for traffic from Genesee would be a problem. Therefore canyon south of Genesee seems to be a better choice.

A large parking garage could be constructed in the canyon on the south side of Genesee. It would need to be a multi-level garage. Probably the best way to access it for westbound traffic would be by providing ramps to an underpass near the west end of the Genesee fill. When placing this underpass consideration needs to be given to the grade for the Sorrento bound line. The eastbound traffic should also have the exit and entrance for the parking garage from Genesee should also be as far west as possible to provide lane transition room for traffic to get positioned for the left turn to I-5 north.

Bus pullouts are needed for both east and west bound traffic. Also some buses may turn around at the station, so parking places for them need to be provided.

Summary

The current LRT Alternatives will not capture the traffic coming south on I-5 to the area south of UCSD. By building a station near Genesee at the canyon just west of I-5 this traffic could be captured. In addition this could route change could prepare the system for extension to Sorrento Valley to a relocated Coaster/Amtrak Station.

Attachments:
I-5 at Genesee Station.pdf
Genesee to Sorrento Trolley.pdf
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The Need for a Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project LRT Station on Genesee at I-5

Need for a Station on Genesee west of I-5

As I review the LRT options for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, none of them provide a station designed to capture southbound traffic from I-5 for the transfer to rail. I believe that this will result in the system failing to move this traffic from the freeway to the Trolley. Therefore I would like to suggest the consideration of a station to be located where Genesee crosses a major canyon west of I-5.

A station at this location could service buses coming up from Sorrento Valley and Torrey Pines Mesa as well as traffic coming south on I-5. It would probably require another bridge or tunnel to cross Genesee to service the parking garage and bus turn around. The parking garage should be located up canyon from (South of) Genesee. The access to I-5 north from eastbound Genesee may have to be relocated, as the current traffic load is maxing out the current configuration of lights and ramps.

Route Change to Serve Station West of I-5

To get to this new station from the current LRT Alternative number one route, a tunnel would need to be built from the UCSD West station north under Voigt Drive and the Canyon View Pool Complex to the canyon north of this complex. This canyon could be followed to a potential station where the canyon crosses Genesee. Here the LRT would turn east and follow Genesee to the University Town Center Transit Center.

Sorrento Valley and High Speed Rail Concerns for route location

When designing the route from the UCSD West Station north, the grade through the tunnel under Voigt should be planned to provide the Trolley a steady grade to eventual continue down to Sorrento Valley to connect with the Coaster and Amtrak (or the High Speed Rail). With this route planned, then the route for the Genesee line should be planned to branch off it. It could either branch where the line to Sorrento Valley comes out of the tunnel under Voigt or it could branch where that line would cross Genesee as it descends to Sorrento.

On the attached map I have shown two routes for the Sorrento Line. The Green line drops more steeply and has to tunnel under Genesee and I-5 to get to the current Coaster Station. The Black line takes a slightly more gradual grade and stays above
Genesee and the I-5 onramp. But it has to curve west away from I-5 to be able to descend into Sorrento Valley and then it curves back to the Coaster station.

On the attached maps I have drawn two different versions of the UCSD to UTC route. The Purple Line branches at the north end of the tunnel under Voigt and stays high to be able to stay above Genesee from I-5 east. While this makes for a flatter grade, it stays too high above the Genesee Station location and would not allow a good connection for trains between UTC and Sorrento. In contrast, the Red Line descends on the grade for the lines to Sorrento Valley. Here a Yellow line shows how a “Y” could connect the line from UTC to Sorrento. From this point the Red Line climbs across Canyon Point and then south to Genesee and follows the other alternates to UTC. Because the Red Line comes down to a level just above Genesee, it makes it easier to access from Genesee at the canyon. But it may be a challenge to find way for it to climb back up to Genesee at Canyon Point Drive.

Some have asked why we shouldn’t construct the extension to Sorrento Valley now. The reason is that the plans for the High Speed Rail route have yet to be decided. Any construction of a trolley route at this time might conflict with the eventual right-of-way for a High Speed Rail tunnel from just north of Balboa Avenue to somewhere in Sorrento Valley and any trolley stations placed there now might not produce the best transfers to and from the future High Speed Station. Therefore an extension north of Genesee to Sorrento Valley should wait until decisions are finalized for the High Speed Rail route and an eventual Balboa to Sorrento Tunnel is built.

The location which makes the most sense for the High Speed Rail/Coaster Station is in the west end of Sorrento Valley just east of the intersection of Carmel Mountain Road and Sorrento Valley Road. The Carmel Mountain exit from the I-5 bypass lanes is only a block from this intersection. Traffic coming north on I-805 or I-5 or south on I-5 or west on Highway 56 all can easily reach this exit. Thus a station here could service people from Poway west and from I-8 north. Therefore it would make an excellent location for a transit center in the northern portion of the City of San Diego with transfers to longer distance rail.

(It should be noted that one can currently leave the Sorrento Station after the southbound Amtrak train goes through, drive at 65 mph to Santa Fe Street, just north of Balboa and have to wait 8-12 minutes for the train to sail past. So a tunnel from just north of Balboa to Sorrento could cut at least 10 minutes off the travel time to Los Angeles.)

When the line is eventually extended north to Sorrento Valley it could have one stop near the current Coaster Station and another in the west end of the valley at the High Speed Rail Station. Beyond this station a fleet of feeder buses make more sense than a LRT extension.

Genesee Line after the Sorrento Valley extension is built
Some have suggested that building alternative number three would make more sense if the line is to be extended to Sorrento Valley. But that route is too circuitous. By building alternative one and then extending it to Sorrento Valley a more direct route is produced. This is likely to attract more riders. But this could leave the Genesee line as a stub branch line.

If we look at the possibility of extending the Genesee line to the Torrey Pines Golf Course with stops at the Science Center Drive, General Atomic, Scripps Green and the Hilton there are clearly problems. Genesee is too steep for rails to follow it west. So this line would need climb north around Ligand Pharmaceuticals; then west around the north side of General Atomic to reach North Torrey pines near Scripps Green. Then it could continue north to the Hilton and the Inn at Torrey Pines. But even this route seems to be too steep. Also this area currently will only generate traffic during rush hours. So it is probably best left to bus and shuttle services.

With a “Y” at the junction with the line between UCSD and Sorrento, the west end of the Genesee line could carry traffic to the High Speed Rail station in Sorrento.

At its east end the line could be extended southeast from the UTC parking lot along Nobel on a descent to the current Amtrak/Coaster line in Rose Canyon. With those trains moved to a Balboa to Sorrento Tunnel, this line should be free to be used by the Trolley to go east to Miramar to service that area. Or it could loop around the north end of the west parking at UTC and follow the mesa east to Miramar.

**Walk-to Traffic Concerns**

Some have expressed a concern that there would be no places within walking distance of this stop that would generate traffic. But it would only be about 2 blocks from establishments on Science Center Drive and about the same distance from the Scripps Hospital’s Emergency Reception Room. While these would not generate great volumes of traffic, they would augment those arriving via bus and car. Sidewalks are needed to encourage this walk in traffic.

**Drive-to Traffic Concerns**

Until a station is developed near the Carmel Mountain Road/Sorrento Valley Road intersection, this would be the station to capture all traffic from the Del Mar Heights/Carmel Valley and northern areas. Even when the High Speed Rail Station is built, this station would capture traffic going to and from the Torrey Pines Mesa area.

To capture the Drive-to traffic, parking is required. The Purple line is so far above Genesee, west of I-5, that some sort of road would be needed to bring vehicles up to the flat where the UCSD agriculture field is located. The Red line is near enough Genesee that parking could be constructed on either side of that road. While there is a nice flat on
the Northwest side of the Genesee/I-5 intersection, access to it for traffic from Genesee would be a problem. Therefore canyon south of Genesee seems to be a better choice.

A large parking garage could be constructed in the canyon on the south side of Genesee. It would need to be a multi-level garage. Probably the best way to access it for westbound traffic would be by providing ramps to an underpass near the west end of the Genesee fill. When placing this underpass consideration needs to be given to the grade for the Sorrento bound line. The eastbound traffic should also have the exit and entrance for the parking garage from Genesee should also be as far west as possible to provide lane transition room for traffic to get positioned for the left turn to I-5 north.

Bus pullouts are needed for both east and west bound traffic. Also some buses may turn around at the station, so parking places for them need to be provided.

Summary

The current LRT Alternatives will not capture the traffic coming south on I-5 to the area south of UCSD. By building a station near Genesee at the canyon just west of I-5 this traffic could be captured. In addition this could route change could prepare the system for extension to Sorrento Valley to a relocated Coaster/Amtrak Station.

Attachments:
I-5 at Genesee Station.pdf
Genesee to Sorrento Trolley.pdf
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Hi Mark,

In this message I address the concept of locating a trolley station south of Highway 52 to service La Jolla, University City and North Clairemont. Since it involves construction of major ramps to carry traffic to and from this station, I suspect that this station is out of the potential budget for the present plans for the midcoast line. But I think that it is a concept that should be designed into the project for eventual construction when finances permit.

I have a pasted the write up for this station below. I have also attached two files: The first is a copy of the write up and the second is a map of the roads that would have to be constructed to service this station.

Thanks for adding it to your considerations,

Rob

Highway 52 Station

Lack of access to the corridor from La Jolla and University City

A great deal of traffic uses La Jolla Parkway (old Ardath Road) to leave La Jolla to go to Pacific Beach, Mission Valley and Downtown. Similarly there is traffic from University City that is headed to these areas. There is also traffic from La Jolla, University City and North Clairemont that wants to go to UCSD. Some of this traffic could be diverted to transit if it could take a bus to a Highway 52 transfer to trolley station. Still more would be willing to use park-and-ride or kiss-and-ride options.

Need for Planning for a Highway 52 Station

While the funds needed to construct the access to this station is beyond what is available for the current project, I believe that planning should be done for this station so provisions can be made for future platforms, parking, ramp locations, etc. Then, if funds
become available, the facilities could be constructed without having to change work done as part of the current project.

Location for this station

As I reflect on the ramp structures that would be needed to take traffic from Highway 52 down to an easy access to the rail lines, I conclude that this station would have to be south of the current Highway 52 overpasses as far south as the point where the current bike path joins Santa Fe Street.

Access Roads Needed

For eastbound traffic a third lane could start where the traffic from the stub of La Jolla Scenic has an on ramp to La Jolla Parkway. From there the lane could climb to the top of the grade and then branch off from the other two lanes just slightly down the grade. (The reason for splitting of here is that traffic for the I-5, southbound, metering light is often backed up to the top of the hill during the afternoon rush hour.) From there it could parallel the onramp to Southbound I-5 but slightly higher on the slope. Then a new bridge could carry it over I-5 to cross Santa Fe Street and the railroad. Then it could turn up Rose Canyon to San Clemente Canyon, and turn right to climb eastbound to rejoin Highway 52. (See the green line on the attached map.)

The westbound traffic would be a bit more complex. It would have to have to fly over the eastbound lanes of Highway 52 and then drop into Rose Canyon to the station (Red line). At this point it would join Santa Fe Street and take it south to the top of a slight rise (Purple line). There it would have to do a right hand U-turn to have room for bus traffic to gain speed needed to merge into the traffic that is exiting I-5 northbound for La Jolla (Red Line). To provide a long enough entry lane to develop sufficient speed would require widening the earthen ramp up to a point short of the bridge portion of this transition ramp.

Where the eastbound route crosses over Santa Fe Street a ramp would be needed to allow westbound kiss-and-ride drivers to return to the east. A similar provision would be needed north of the station to allow eastbound drivers to return to the west. These crossovers need to be located where they allow access to parking lots as well as kiss-and-ride drop offs and parking for buses, which may turn around at this station.

Walk-in Traffic

To the south of this station location there are businesses located between the track and Rose Creek. Arrangements should be made to allow foot traffic to come through their property to the station from the businesses just north of Jutland Drive. Also sidewalks should be provided from the Trailer Park up to the station.

Attachment:
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Highway 52 Station

Lack of access to the corridor from La Jolla and University City

A great deal of traffic uses La Jolla Parkway (was Ardath Road) to leave La Jolla to go to Pacific Beach, Mission Valley and Downtown. Similarly there is traffic from University City that is headed to these areas. There is also traffic from La Jolla, University City and North Clairemont that wants to go to UCSD. Some of this traffic could be diverted to transit if it could take a bus to a Highway 52 transfer to trolley station. Still more would be willing to use park-and-ride or kiss-and-ride options.

Need for Planning for a Highway 52 Station

While the funds needed to construct the access to this station is beyond what is available for the current project, I believe that planning should be done for this station so provisions can be made for future platforms, parking, ramp locations, etc. Then, if funds become available, the facilities could be constructed without having to change work done as part of the current project.

Location for this station

As I reflect on the ramp structures that would be needed to take traffic from Highway 52 down to an easy access to the rail lines, I conclude that this station would have to be south of the current Highway 52 overpasses as far south as the point where the current bike path joins Santa Fe Street.

Access Roads Needed

For eastbound traffic a third lane could start where the traffic from the stub of La Jolla Scenic has an on ramp to La Jolla Parkway. From there the lane could climb to the top of the grade and then branch off from the other two lanes just slightly down the grade. (The reason for splitting of here is that traffic for the I-5, southbound, metering light is often backed up to the top of the hill during the afternoon rush hour.) From there it could parallel the onramp to Southbound I-5 but slightly higher on the slope. Then a new bridge could carry it over I-5 to cross Santa Fe Street and the railroad. Then it could turn up Rose Canyon to San Clemente Canyon, and turn right to climb eastbound to rejoin Highway 52. (See the green line on the attached map.)

The westbound traffic would be a bit more complex. It would have to fly over the eastbound lanes of Highway 52 and then drop into Rose Canyon to the station (Red line). At this point it would join Santa Fe Street and take it south to the top of a slight rise (Purple line). There it would have to do a right hand U-turn to have room for bus traffic to gain speed needed to merge into the traffic that is exiting I-5 northbound for
La Jolla (Red Line). To provide a long enough entry lane to develop sufficient speed would require widening the earthen ramp up to a point short of the bridge portion of this transition ramp.

Where the eastbound route crosses over Santa Fe Street a ramp would be needed to allow westbound kiss-and-ride drivers to return to the east. A similar provision would be needed north of the station to allow eastbound drivers to return to the west. These crossovers need to be located where they allow access to parking lots as well as kiss-and-ride drop offs and parking for buses, which may turn around at this station.

Walk-in Traffic

To the south of this station location there are businesses located between the track and Rose Creek. Arrangements should be made to allow foot traffic to come through their property to the station from the businesses just north of Jutland Drive. Also sidewalks should be provided from the Trailer Park up to the station.

Attachment:
Highway 52 station.pdf
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Hi again Mark,

The final set of comments I have for the MidCoast Corridor Transit Project are about the need for a road to connect Grand Avenue with Morena Blvd to provide an another route for traffic to get to the Balboa Station from Pacific Beach.

Thank you for including them in your study,

Rob

Balboa Station Challenges

Congestion Problems for Accessing the Balboa Station

One of the major generators of potential riders is the Pacific Beach area. Many students and employees of UCSD live there. Getting them from their residents to the Trolley is a major challenge. The intersection of Mission Bay and Garnet/Balboa is one of the busiest in the city. Westbound traffic for this light is often backed up for several cycles. Eastbound the traffic isn’t much better.

Eastbound traffic approaching the station area enters an area that is already full of dangerous cross traffic. Vehicles exiting I-5 northbound have to do a sharp turn under the railroad tracks and then merge with eastbound traffic. Eastbound traffic that is headed for Morena Blvd. must merge right into this freeway exiting traffic. This would also be the move that any traffic seeking to get into the Balboa Station parking lot would have to make. Westbound traffic has similar merge problems. Getting from the Balboa Station parking lot into westbound Balboa traffic requires crossing some traffic and merging with others. Then it has to face the Mission Bay Drive congestion.

Grand Avenue to Morena Blvd. Fly-Over

A solution to the challenges of Balboa/Garnet would be to have the city provide a connection from Grand Avenue that would cross Mission Bay Drive, I-5 and the railroads at altitude and merge into Morena Blvd. If this route flew over Bunker Hill Street, it would reach Morena on a curve. The next street south is Glendora. It would result in an intersection with Morena where there is already a challenging turn off from Morena. The third street south is Rosewood. A road to it would have to fly over a portion of the golf
course before turning over Rosewood. But it would intersect Morena far enough south of
the station to provide a reasonable place for on and off ramps to touch down.
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No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Richard [dlarsen-1@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 7:21 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please do not consider routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. The I-5 route would serve UCSD better, probably cost less, and spare one of San Diego's last natural treasures.

Sincerely,
Dick Larsen
San Diego
92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Keith Lazerson [kl9@san.rr.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 6:20 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Keith Lazerson
5908 Eton Ct
San Diego, CA 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts. Michael and I have lived in our area for over twenty years and watched its growth. We often use this park to hike and enjoy open space just steps away from our now busy high density living environment. We always appreciate watching the wildlife and nature changing throughout the year. It is the highlight of living in this neighborhood. Michael is a school teacher at Curie Elementary and has taken his fourth graders into the canyon. For many of his students, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life. Please do not destroy this very special place that is becoming more rare to find in San Diego.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Michael Leavenworth
7942 Playmor Terrace
San Diego, Ca 92122
I think that the proposed LRT Alternative Line 3 is the best choice because it sets things up nicely to expand the line up to the Del Mar Fairgrounds some time in the future, which would be good for both parking relief for UCSD and travelers from the South going to the Fairgrounds. The problem with Alternative Line 1 is that it creates a hook that makes it hard to expand northward, which I feel is a natural at some future date. I also know that the Transit Board has wanted to make the Northern Golden Triangle a "Second Downtown" for San Diego, and would turn the hook of Alternative Line 1 into a full loop like we have in Downtown San Diego in order to run lines off of in the future. I think this is totally unnecessary and not a good idea. Perhaps another line branching off of this proposed one continuing to follow the current rail lines eastwards towards Miramar, then breaking off there at the base and then turning northward to the North County Fair Shopping Center and the San Diego Wild Animal Park would be another good line addition; but any more than that would not be as successful in my opinion. The Trolley is a good compliment for most people to the automobile, but it is not a full replacement of it. I do not think that it is a panacea for all of our transportation needs. It is in need of for connecting our high traffic destination points together and with alternative drop off points in order to relieve traffic congestion and parking issues. And it is needed for those of us that do not have an automobile and for foreign travelers to this city that I know use the system in order to get around here. That being said, I am a big supporter of it and I do think that it is a big part of our transportation solutions for the future.

Andrew M. Leeper,
Concerned Citizen of the San Diego Region.
To SanDag:

I live in La Jolla. I strongly prefer the LRT - Alternative #1, because it has a stop west of the I-5 near Nobel Drive and Villa La Jolla Dr. There are two very big shopping centers there with a lot of traffic. The Trolley would really help reduce traffic in that area.

Can you also extend the Trolley to connect with the Amtrak line near UCSD. Many UCSD people use the Amtrak, but they have to travel many miles to Solana Beach now. An intermodal transit station between the Amtrak and Trolley in the UTC area would really reduce traffic caused by UCSD.

J. H. Lin, La Jolla, CA 92037
In general I support this proposed light rail transport concept/route from Old Town to UCSD.

Here I wish to concentrate on a small portion of the proposal, namely the section between Balboa Avenue and Route 52. At present bicyclists and walkers have to cross the railway tracks just south of Route 52 to get from the dead-end Santa Fe St to the Marian Bear Park trail, as there is no through route.

1) At a minimum, provide a pedestrian bridge or tunnel over or under all the tracks.

2) Secondly, provide a path from that location beside the new tracks to Balboa Avenue. Also provide environmental remediation to Rose Creek in that area - it is badly needed.

3) Thirdly, provide a layout and plan for the Balboa Station that could be compatible with some redevelopment in that area. For instance a large parking garage/area, as this could become a focus for many commuters going either north or south. Is the Rose Creek Operations Area available?

4) Fourthly, consider that this railway could be the backbone for a major redevelopment of that section of Clairemont and Pacific Beach. See the separate attachment.

Thanks,

Robert Little
**Northern entrance to Mission Bay/Pacific Beach**

The main objective is to improve/develop the NE section of MB/PB/Clairemont by making it an environmentally attractive, mainly recreationally oriented area which will encourage people to visit/stay.

**Ingredients:**

1. Redo the I5 intersection and on/off ramps at MB Drive. One suggestion is to widen the southbound exit and make the northbound entrance go round from Balboa Ave to I5. Separate pedestrians and cyclists from major roads.
2. Improve Rose Creek, expand the KF reserve as is being discussed by several groups, and necessary to keep the wetlands area viable. (Rose Creek ....). Change the present Campland into an “educational marsh”.
3. Remove De Anza Cove trailers (2017?) and move Campland somewhere else (e.g. combine with Santa Fe RV area or put Campland there) to make that part/all of that area an expanded wetland with the KF marsh.
4. Provide recreation oriented stores small and/or large (e.g. move REI. Runners World...)
5. Hotels/motels/ parking garages.
6. Major small boat and water sports center in section east of DeAnza cove.
7. Hiking/running/bicycling routes around MB, and north to La Jolla, Soledad Mt, Clairemont, M Bear park.
8. Mass transit /trolley station for SD. See SANDAG proposal (4/2010) for light rail from Old Town to UCSD. This could be used as a backbone for the whole development.
9. Condominiums, apartments, restaurants along part of Rose Creek.
10. Selected small industries? (e.g. move the existing ones on the dead-end Damon? street, or clean energy R&D, ...). Consider a modern EU-style incinerator facility. See NYT 4/13/10. It could be placed where the present City marshalling yard exists, or maybe Sea World would be interested in putting it on the south shore of the bay.
11. Environmental education
12. Golf course.
13. Time scale >10 years.
14. Money: some mixture of commercial/state/federal/city but probably most will have to be commercial. Many comments could be made here. If one does everything noted above it could be in the $100M$ class. Note that for many years revenues from Mission Bay Park went largely to the San Diego general fund. There is now a City of San Diego law (Prop C) that mandates for the next 30 years some 10-20% or ~5M$ of the MB annual lease revenues go to MB improvements, provided a threshold of $20-25M of lease revenues has been exceeded. Such a threshold has been exceeded in the past by a few M$ but will not occur in 2010.
15. There is an existing proposal waiting SD funding for a bridge across Rose Creek to permit completion of a trail around M Bay.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Michele Lolly [mflolly@wilsonlolly.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 9:19 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Michele Lolly
858.922.3302
mflolly@wilsonlolly.com
BettysOnBoards.com
Hello,

In regards to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, I would vote for LRT Alternative #1. I am employed in the Mira Mesa area and believe if you could get the transit line to the furthest northern point, you’d have a much higher chance of people in the Mira Mesa corporate district able to take the trolley and either bike or take a bus the remainder of the way to work.

Sincerely,
Melissa Maigler
Hello Nancy,

The illustrative map featured in the newsletter below and on the SANDAG Web site www.sandag.org/midcoast is designed to provide a one-page view of the three alternatives under consideration during scoping. This map is for illustrative purposes only. Please refer to the technical maps in the Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report to review the three alternatives under consideration during scoping.

Thank you,
Anne

Anne Howard Steinberger
Marketing Manager
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 699-1937
(619) 699-1905
Visit our Web site at www.sandag.org

Hi Anne,

About a week ago, I had a telephone conversation with Greg Gastelum regarding the proposed trolley alignment along I-5. I pointed out to him that the video Mid-Coast is showing has the trolley line on the east side of I-5 all the way up to the Nobel Station where it then crosses over to the west side of I-5 at La Jolla Village Shopping Center. The map given below on your June addition still has the old map alignment which is incorrect according to your video that Greg told me has the latest proposed alignment (i.e. on the east side of I-5 and not on the west side of I-5). Could you please get back to me as soon as possible on the correct alignment along I-5? It would be important to correct your map for the scoping period so the public has accurate information to provide the feedback you are seeking. Thank you.

Nancy McLaughlin

On Jun 1, 2010, at 12:42 PM, Anne Steinberger wrote:
Welcome to the June edition of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project eNewsletter. This newsletter will provide you with up-to-date information about this important expansion of San Diego's regional transit system.

**Scoping for Mid-Coast project a success**
From May 3 through June 1, 2010, SANDAG conducted scoping for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The scoping period allowed the public the opportunity to comment on project alternatives, the project's purpose and need, issues to be studied in the environmental document, and the draft Public Involvement Plan. Five scoping meetings were held at locations throughout the corridor to solicit public input. Nearly 300 people participated in these scoping meetings, with additional comments being submitted by mail, fax and e-mail. These public comments will help SANDAG develop the scope of the draft environmental document, assess project alternatives and determine which alternative(s) should be studied further in the draft environmental document.

**Decision on Mid-Coast Project expected in summer**
A decision about which project alternative(s) will move forward for further study in the draft environmental document for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is expected in summer 2010. Now that the scoping period is complete, SANDAG staff will review public input on the project alternatives and prepare a Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report. This report will include information about the development and evaluation of alternatives, a summary of comments received during scoping along with responses, and a recommendation on which alternative(s) should move forward for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document. The recommendations are expected to be considered by the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working...
June meeting of the Project Working Group cancelled
The June 2010 meeting of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (PWG) has been cancelled. The next meeting is expected to be held on July 14, 2010, where SANDAG will present the comments provided during the scoping period, the Final Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report, and the recommendation for the alternative(s) to move forward for further study in the draft environmental document. The meeting will be scheduled in advance of the SANDAG Transportation Committee consideration of the report. Agendas and meeting materials for past meetings of the PWG are available on the SANDAG Web site.

Urban Area Transit Strategy moves forward
SANDAG is working to craft a new vision for public transit as part of its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This vision of creating a world-class transit system is taking shape now, as SANDAG develops the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS), an innovative transit network within the San Diego region. The goals of the UATS are to maximize transit ridership in the greater urbanized area of the region, and to test the role of the transit network to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. Three network alternatives have been developed to test the advantages and disadvantages of different transit approaches. Public comments on the three network alternatives are encouraged. Please e-mail your comments to 2050rtp@sandag.org.

What is the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project?
The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend transit service from the Old Town Transit Center north to the University City community, serving major destinations including Westfield University Towne Centre shopping mall, UCSD, and downtown San Diego.
Dear representatives,

I believe that the Trolley would best be routed along Interstate 805 from Mission Valley to Noble Drive and then west to UCSD.

Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon are ecological treasures. The plants and animals in these "greenbelts" need to be protected. In addition, migratory birds use the Marion Bear/San Clemente Canyon area and Rose Canyon area twice every year.

Thank you for protecting Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon.

Julie Medlock

5710 Bloch Street
San Diego Ca  92122
858 450-0101

San Diego Zoo
Research assistant
mira [mira2356@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 8:03 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Mira
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Meghan Morris
local home owner and avid trail runner
To all concerned –

While I am a strong supporter of efficient mass transit, I am also a strong supporter of our remaining scraps of urban open space. Please route the proposed trolley line away from Rose Canyon Open Space Park as much as possible. I grew up exploring and playing in this canyon, and am delighted to be able to share it with my children. While it is not exactly pristine currently, the added presence of the trolley traffic and infrastructure would detract greatly from the “wild” feel in the stretch from I5 to Genessee Avenue.

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genessee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genessee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Peter Newman
6017 Dirac St., S.D. 92122
To: SANDAG committee considering proposed trolley routes:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

In addition to the adverse environmental impact of LRT 3, please note the significant additional cost and likely delays due to the tunnel proposed in LRT 3 under Decoro Avenue. Tunnels under neighborhood streets will significantly increase noise and vibration for residents there and will be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate. The LRT 1 route is a much better alternative for all the residents in the southwestern "section" of the UTC area (and has better station placement as well -- after all, we want to use the trolley, too).

Sincerely,
To: SANDAG committee considering proposed trolley routes:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

In addition to the adverse environmental impact of LRT 3, please note the significant additional cost and likely delays due to the tunnel proposed in LRT 3 under Decoro Avenue. Tunnels under neighborhood streets will significantly increase noise and vibration for residents there and will be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate. The LRT 1 route is a much better alternative for all the residents in the southwestern "section" of the UTC area (and has better station placement as well -- after all, we want to use the trolley, too).

Sincerely,

Christopher Nielsen
4225 Caminito Cassis
San Diego, CA 92122
858-452-0495
To All Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Teresa Norris
13025 Via Del Toro
Poway, CA 92064
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
John Nowell [jnowell@bcdev.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 8:49 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

My family and I strongly oppose the trolley route through Rose Canyon.

Sincerely,

John Nowell
University City
###
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Emmi Olson [meep555@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 1:21 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. My husband and I have walked in this canyon nearly every week since arriving in San Diego nine years ago. We take our friends from out of town there when they come to show them the beautiful environment we call home. The park is a well utilized community resource. Every time we go, we see at least 5-10 other people out jogging, walking their dogs and enjoying the sunshine. Although I am strongly in favor of mass transportation and very much would like to see the Trolley come to UCSD, there must be an alternative route that would not threaten one of the few natural canyons and wildlife refuges San Diego has left.

The proposed LRT-1 route is one of those alternatives. There are other reasons to prefer the LRT-1 route. As a UCSD student who would consider living further from campus and taking the Trolley to school daily, I would much prefer a more direct Trolley route that came straight from downtown to campus without detouring around the canyon to UTC and then to campus. Furthermore, I do not know how the City would find space on campus to house an end Trolley stop without taking away more parking lots. Seeing as how there is already such limited parking at UCSD, this would pose a real problem for commuters who are not on the Trolley line or professional students who are forced to drive due to the odd hours they are expected in hospitals (neither the shuttle nor the Trolley to my knowledge run at 4:00AM!). In contrast, I have lived in this area for years and have never seen the UTC mall have a parking problem.

San Diego has so few beautiful places to walk and enjoy the coastal desert. Please protect the ones that we do have by choosing a more practical route for the Trolley expansion.

Sincerely,

Emmi Olson
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Adelle Owen [owead@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 4:17 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov; sherrilightner@sandiego.gov

Please, no trolley or any other construction for travel or transportation through Rose Canyon. It is a San Diego sanctuary that we need for a balanced life and quiet time to enjoy wildlife and the natural surroundings. A. Owen
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a strong proponent of getting mass transit to the UTC area. I have looked at the proposed routes for the trolley and I see no advantage of routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. In fact, if the major users will be near UCSD, that the route through the canyon puts these stops at the end of the line. It seems clear that the route along I-5 is the most direct route to the major stops within UTC (UCSD and the large hospitals). Having the route terminate at the transit center at UTC mall instead of UCSD West appears to offer additional advantages.

Given these considerations, I urge you to choose LRT-1 for the trolley route.

Thank you,

________________________
George Papen
6636 Red Deer St.
San Diego, CA 92122

email: gpapen@me.com
I oppose the Rose Canyon Light Rail route
Lance Parker [parkeld@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 9:22 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

I live ten feet from the canyon and my 3- and 5- year old boys love exploring it, chasing each other, finding bugs and rabbits, and figuring out how to cross the creek at different water levels. We would love to have a mass transit option for going downtown that is more convenient, but probably wouldn't use it very much as there isn't much reason to go downtown for our family. If you're really certain that the project would benefit the region by reducing vehicle miles traveled, reducing pollution, or increasing transit speed then I urge you to evaluate the I-5 route to UCSD.

Sincerely,

Lance Parker
7860 Camino Jonata
San Diego, CA 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

There is no need to destroy an open space that so many people currently use in San Diego. Also do we or do we not treasure our wildlife? Rose Canyon is a wonderland of San Diego native plants and animals. Please protect it.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Cynthia Parnell
2750 Wheatstone St
San Diego, CA 92111
I strongly oppose the creation of a trolley route through Rose Canyon. I do not live on the Canyon, but I hike or jog through it several times a week, and I am *appalled* at the idea of this rare natural space being destroyed to make room for a trolley. Please do not support this plan.

Hal Pashler
3521 Stetson Avenue
San Diego, CA
May 31, 2010

Ms. Leslie Blanda

Mid-Coast Comments

Draft SEIS/SEIR

SANDAG

401 B Street, Suite 800

San Diego, CA 92010

Dear Ms. Leslie Blanda:

I sent you my comments on the scoping process on the LTR project less than an hour ago, but found several mistakes in spelling on the comment attachment. I have made corrections and hope you can substitute this attachment for the previous one I sent.

Thank you,

Billy Paul

2747 Fairfield St

San Diego, CA 92110

619-276-8333
May 31, 2010
Ms. Leslie Blanda
Mid-Coast Comments
Draft SEIS/SEIR
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92010

Dear Ms. Leslie Blanda:

Thank you for the presentations to numerous community groups and the opportunity to present scoping comments on the proposed Draft SEIS/SEIR for the Mid Coast Project.

I have followed the proposed plan for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project for approximately 15 years. I was a member of the previous Mid-Coast Corridor Community Advisory Group and represented the Clairemont Community Planning Group at that time. I am well acquainted with the proposed stops in the Clairemont area and the proposed routes through La Jolla and the University City communities.

While the current plan has looked at a number of different routes through the La Jolla and University City communities, I would like to express my conditional support for Alternative 1 (which combines 1, 4, & 5). My conditional support is due to the lack of a station being proposed for the Veteran's Administration Hospital.

I am a former Marine and Viet Nam Veteran. While in Viet Nan, I volunteered to be a door gunner on the CH-46 Sea Knight helicopters. Life expectancy for the flight crew was approximately 6 months. The flight helmet I was given came from a pilot who had been killed or wounded. I specialized in flying on med-evacs, as I have some medical knowledge, and would help treat the wounded after we were out of enemy fire. Most of our wounded had a leg blown off or damaged, many had an arm mostly blown off, many were just full of holes squirting blood, and a lot of them came back in body bags. I was lucky, I did not get injured or wounded, but two of my best friends were blown to pieces. Currently, I am handicapped with a replaced hip and I receive medical care at the VA Hospital in La Jolla.

ALL OF YOUR PROPOSED ROUTES HAVE A FATAL FLAW IN NOT HAVING A TROLLEY STOP AT THE VA HOSPITAL. We are here today discussing the different routes proposed for this transit project only because of the sacrifice our veterans have made to protect our right to free speech and to fight against the tyrannical governments that have gone to war against us and our way of life.

I am writing this on Memorial Day, which we as a Nation have dedicated this day to honor our war dead and those who gave their life to defend our country. We also need to honor those who have lived through their military experience, but have suffered damage from enemy fire or their experience in fighting for our cherished freedom. We also have those former military persons who risked their life to fight for their country,
and now find themselves in need of the medical attention they can only receive at the VA Hospital.

OUR MILITARY VETERANS HAVE EARNED THE RIGHT TO HAVE A TROLLEY STATION CLOSE TO THE WEST OR EAST ENTRANCE OF THE VA HOSPITAL. There are three major entrances to the VA Hospital. The Main Entrance is on the south, but this location is probably not the best for a Trolley Station. There is also an entrance on the west which is also the Emergency Entrance which there is plenty of room for a Trolley Station and elevated trolley route on the way to UCSD. On the east side there is also a major entrance and room for a Trolley Station, but the station needs to be closer to the hospital than the current proposed routes are planned to be located.

DON'T TELL A VETERAN IN A WHEEL CHAIR THAT HE CAN JUST GO TWO BLOCKS TO THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED TROLLEY STATION. I drove the distance in my can and found it to be over a half a mile away, and goes up and down a steep hill. When you can have stations in downtown San Diego that are closer than this, you can certainly accommodate a veteran at the VA Hospital who had his legs blown off in a war. Even in your current plan, you have able bodied executives and workers who are given a Trolley Station at Executive Drive which is two blocks away from the Trolley Station proposed for UTC. Don't get me wrong, I am not saying there should not be a station at Executive Drive, I am merely saying we need to respect and honor our veterans and give them a Trolley Station close to the entrance to the VA Hospital.

DON'T TELL A VETERAN TO TAKE A SHUTTLE TO THE UCSD TROLLEY STATION. Once again you are treating the veteran as a second class citizen, that college students are more important than a veteran who risked his life and suffered an injury. When a person is in a wheel chair or one that has difficulty walking, to have to wait for a shuttle to make the connection to the Trolley Station, this is too long to wait. Their life is already slowed down by their handicap. It is unconscionable that the trolley route would be proposed without a stop at the VA Hospital. I am also not saying that there should not be a Trolley Station specifically for students going to UCSD. This station is important too! But don't discount our veterans who have earned the right to have their own Trolley Station more than anyone!

DON'T HONOR THE JUST THE VETERANS WHO HAVE DIED--AND REFUSE TO HONOR THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN WOUNDED OR INJURED. It is important that we honor all veterans and even if a Trolley Station at the VA Hospital would not provide the number of riders you would like for a traditional station, this station will have a large number of handicapped veterans using it, and this needs to give it extra points for veterans (who are not handicapped) and extra points for veterans who are handicapped.

The VA Hospital also hires a large number of health care professionals who would use the trolley if the Trolley Station was close to and convenient for the workers at the VA Hospital. Many of these people are also veterans.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT IN THE SCOPING PROCESS YOU CONSIDER A TROLLEY ROUTE THAT STOPS CLOSE TO THE VA HOSPITAL, EITHER
CLOSE TO THE WEST ENTRANCE OR CLOSE TO THE EAST ENTRANCE, AND NOT A LONG DISTANCE AWAY.

Thank you for your consideration,

Billy Paul
2747 Fairfield St
San Diego, CA 92110
619-276-8333
To Whom:

The proposed UCSD trolley extension could potentially save my job at UC San Diego. I live in Point Loma, so I travel the I-5 freeway to and from work. I was recently diagnosed with Parkinson’s Disease, and eventually driving will not be possible, though my ability to contribute at UC San Diego will continue past the time I should no longer be driving.

If my husband were able to drop me off in Old Town on his way to work, it could potentially extend my career at UCSD, and perhaps shorten the time I would have to rely on Disability in the future.

Thank you,

Gretchen M. Pelletier, M.A.
Senior Writer, Office of Development
University of California, San Diego
858.822.6605 gpelletier@ucsd.edu
Dear Sir or Madam:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. The route LRT 3 would, for no good reason, devastate Rose Canyon park (one of the few open spaces left in San Diego, used by lots of San Diego residents, young to old). I strongly urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD, which would much better serve UC community destinations.

Sincerely,
M. Petrie
Caminito Dia
San Diego 92122
Please route the trolley up I5 from Old Town with a stop at Nobel and then onto UCSD's campus. You must not take it through beautiful Rose Canyon Open Space Park. I walked in the canyon on Mother's Day. The hillsides were awash in purple and yellow flowers as far as the eyes could see. It was lovely! All I could hear were bees buzzing and a myriad of birds singing. It is a peaceful, serene setting in the middle of University City -- a place for all San Diegans to go to get away from the "rat race." Yes, one can hear the occasional train, but not very often. Having the trolley rolling through every 15 minutes would destroy the beauty of the park. Please don't take away this precious resource for the people of San Diego.

Thank you.

Shelley Plumb
San Diego
-----Original Message-----
From: Powell Jr., Frank [mailto:fpowell@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 4:36 PM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping

I attended the meeting at UCSD last week and would like to propose an alternative, which you have already seen from a colleague of mine. A map is attached and you will see it is a variation on what I understand to be the preferred Alternative 1.

For UCSD, the most important difference is that this variation does not go through the middle of campus. For everyone else, it satisfies all the same demands as Alternative 1 for local hospitals, schools, employers/businesses and shopping malls.

I understand that initial input from UCSD students wanted a stop to be as close as possible to the center of campus. However, any above ground route with a central stop will isolate part of the campus.

More importantly, I propose that easy access for the VA Hospital patients with this variation is more justifiable than having young, able-bodied students walk another 800 feet to the bookstore. The Academic Senate committees will be meeting with the students more about this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frank L. Powell, Ph.D.
Professor, Dept. of Medicine
Vice Chair 2009-2001, Academic Senate, San Diego Division University of California, San Diego-0623
tel: (858) 534-4191, F X: (858) 534-4812 fpowell@ucsd.edu
Please route the trolley up the 5, not through the canyon
Pratt, Charles [charlie@lepinelaw.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 5:24 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org; midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

I write to oppose routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. There have been recent proposals to put roads and rails through Rose Canyon when alternatives would be more efficient and less expensive, so that the old quip that "nature abhors a vacuum" comes to mind. A consistent thread running through all these ill-considered proposals is how understated is the damage to our local treasure has been. Massive retaining walls and fences, construction impacts on the canyon and Rose Creek, and the estimated frequency of rail trips argue for alternative choices that will preserve one of San Diego's jewels. As a voter and political activist I intend to support political leaders who choose to preserve our canyon but for the others, as Jon Stuart might remark on the Daily Show, "not so much." I believe many of my neighbors in University City would agree. Please do the right thing, route the trolley up the 5, spare our canyon!
Pax,
Dr. Charles L. Pratt, Esq.
University City
To Whom It May Concern:

As an economics professor at UCSD, I am very excited about the prospect of a trolley route to UCSD. However, I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

I am among the many people who use the Rose Canyon park to hike, observe wildlife, and photograph. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys.

We have so little open space left in San Diego. Basic economic theory says that when the supply of a good goes down, the price, or value, of the good should rise. For this reason, the value of open space in San Diego is at an all-time high.

Please preserve Rose Canyon as a natural treasure. Do not destroy it by making it yet another transportation corridor. Please use the I-5 for the trolley route.

Sincerely,

Valerie Ramey
3225 Millikin Avenue
San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
David P. Ramirez [dramirez@kringandchung.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 9:20 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

David P. Ramirez
KRING & CHUNG, LLP
11622 El Camino Real
Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92130
858.436.0268
858.436.0279 Fax
dramirez@kringandchung.com
http://www.kringandchung.com
This e-mail message contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive messages for the addressee), you may not use, copy, or disclose this message (or any information contained in it) to anyone. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message.

Nothing in this message should be interpreted as a digital or electronic signature that can be used to authenticate a contract or other legal document. Further, do not rely upon this e-mail for legal advice unless you have a signed retention agreement to receive legal advice from the Law Offices of Kring and Chung LLP. Thank you.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Jane E Richardson [jer@ntrs.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:23 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilighther@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

I am a registered voter and a 30 + year resident of San Diego. I've lived the last 21 years in University City and am strongly opposed to running the trolley through Rose Canyon when there are less environmentally sensitive alternatives. Rose Canyon is a treasure, let's preserve it for our future generations. Given the ever growing population density of San Diego having a natural open space such as Rose Canyon within our midst is a blessing to us all. Please consider other options and safeguard Rose Canyon!

Thank you.

JR
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Bob Riffenburgh

3069 Award Row

San Diego CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Rigoli, Rachel [rrigoli@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 4:43 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. My family and I use Rose Canyone all the time -- to bike ride, hike and to explore.

Sincerely,

Rachel Rigoli and David Erving
5688 Lord Cecil St.
San Diego, CA 92122
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Anne-Catherine Roch-Levecq, PhD

Oceanside, CA 92056
FW: (no subject)
Betsy Rudee [brudee@san.rr.com]

To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

On Sun 05/30/10 3:02 PM, "Betsy Rudee" brudee@san.rr.com sent:
To Whom it may Concern:

I oppose the LRT 3 option for routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue. I strongly urge you to delete this route altogether from any more consideration in the environmental study. Rose Canyon Open Space Park is used by people from all over San Diego for hiking, cycling, jogging and enjoying nature. Recent efforts on the part of the Children and Nature Collaborative in San Diego have incorporated this area into the Nearby Nature Program for school students. This alone is a big reason to leave this area alone for the study of nature by our young people, who are locked into non-nature and sedentary activities too often. There are four schools in the neighborhood surrounding Rose Canyon, roughly forty-five hundred students within walking distance of the park. They already use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature, an experience that, for many of these children, is one of the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife. It is a major wildlife corridor. The City of San Diego has already committed to its conservation, in order to protect its bio-diversity and the area’s quality of life.

Please drop LRT 3 entirely from any consideration for a trolley route.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rudee
La Jolla
Comment on Midcoast LRT routes
melhinton@sbcglobal.net [melhinton@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 1:22 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov; Jim Peugh [peugh@cox.net]

May 31, 2010

SANDAG Staff,

San Diego Audubon supports the use of mass transit as an alternative to the expanded use of automobiles. Accordingly, we have considered the various route options for extending the Light Rail Transit (LRT) system to University City and the UCSD campus. We believe that the LRT-1 route or a similar alternative is the best choice for the environment and ridership.

The design of this project, especially the preferred route selection, must consider a number of key factors: habitat loss, wildlife corridors, noise, wetlands, public recreational impacts, air and water pollution, impacts to scenic qualities, public safety, and related issues. Since Rose Creek parallels much of the proposed route, impacts to this waterway and its riparian habitat are of special concern. The LRT tracks should be located as far as possible from the creek, thus preserving existing habitat and avoiding expensive mitigation. In those areas where a concrete channel exists, such as the Highway 52 interchange, every effort should be made to restore a natural creek bed and enhance wildlife corridors.

Since the LRT-3 alternative will have significant environmental impacts to Rose Canyon in addition to Rose Creek, it should be deleted from consideration in the Environmental Impact Report.

Our organization conducts public birding trips to Rose Canyon and is actively involved in the preservation of wildlife and natural habitat throughout San Diego County. We look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Mel Hinton
Past President
San Diego Audubon Society
melhinton@sbcglobal.net
Councilmember Sherri Lightner Scoping Comments
Mays, Jesse [JMays@sandiego.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 2:49 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Attachments: [Open as Web Page]

Attached please find a letter with Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project scoping comments from Councilmember Sherri Lightner. This letter is concurrently being sent via U.S. Mail.

Sincerely,

Jesse Mays

Jesse Mays
Council Representative
Office of Councilmember Sherri S. Lightner
First District, City of San Diego
202 C Street, MS 10A
San Diego, CA 92101
jmays@sandiego.gov
P: (619) 236-7294
F: (619) 236-6999
www.sandiego.gov/cd1

Disclosure: This email is public information. Correspondence to and from this email address is recorded and may be viewed by third parties and the public upon request.
June 1, 2010

Mid-Coast Comments
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Comments

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter includes my comments for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project purpose and need, alternatives, and issues to be studied in the environmental document.

There is a need for additional mass transit alternatives in the University City area. Improving access to transit in our neighborhoods will improve quality of life, reduce our impact on the environment, and facilitate economic development. The population of the University Community is projected to grow considerably in the next two decades, and in order to avoid gridlock on our streets we must develop a mass transit system that is efficient, green, and attractive to riders. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will help meet these needs.

I support the selection of LRT 1 (I-5 to UCSD to UTC) as the preferred alternative for environmental study, and the deletion of LRT 3 (Rose Canyon to UTC to UCSD) from further consideration. There is broad community consensus for LRT 1, which will ensure community support for the project and improve chances for Federal funding. There is strong community opposition to LRT 3. LRT 1 avoids impacts to Rose Canyon Open Space Park, whereas LRT 3 would have huge, unmitigable impacts. Finally, LRT 1 is also the most cost effective alternative presented, whereas LRT 3 is the least cost effective light rail alternative presented.

The environmental document should include, but not be limited to, study of the following impacts: noise, visual, environmental, property, parking, air quality, aesthetic, and traffic (including the construction phases).

If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sherri S. Lightner
Councilmember, District 1
City of San Diego
To whom it may concern,

I wish to say that it would be a great benefit to commuters such as myself that work around the La Jolla/University City area if the trolley line is expanded to include a route from Old Town to University City. I hope that this project is successful, and it could go a long way toward improving our options for public transit in the greater San Diego County area, and the reduction of use of automobiles and polluting emissions.

Elizabeth Santillanez
esantillanez@ucsd.edu
(858) 822-4060
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Fred Saxon [fsaxon@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:52 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

PLEASE, Save Rose Canyon from further DESTRUCTION, Noise and Environmental pollution!

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.
Fred Saxon
Millikin Ave.
San Diego, 92122
Delete trolley route LRT 3 through Rose Canyon
David and/or Helene [davidandhelene@san.rr.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 10:59 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

We strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). We urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. We urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek. The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.
Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.
Sincerely,
David and Helene Schlafman
5534 Honors Dr
San Diego, 92122
(43 year residents at this address)
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Sam Schramski

5761 Carnegie St.

San Diego, CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Schulman, Judy [jschulman@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:18 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To all those concerned:

Please don't spoil our beautiful and historic canyon! Once ruined, it can never be truly restored. Given all the building that is going on, we need to preserve what is left of our precious open spaces, not abuse them.

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Judy Schulman
4055-148 Porte La Paz
San Diego, CA 92122
connect UCSD to existing transit lines
Kelly Seiler [kelly.seiler@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 11:29 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

I think all the schools in the area should be connected to existing transit lines. Adding UCSD to the list of connected schools is a step in the right direction. When I went to school in San Luis Obispo I used the buses and my bike to get back and forth to school. It saved me tons on money on parking (and was good exercise!).

Other concerns:
- I grew up in Rancho Penasquitos (PQ) and I know many people who went to UCSD. It is frustrating for those who don't have cars to get to their parent's homes because there is no East / West connection.
- I wish the Coaster went up the 15 / 163 instead of that goofy carpool lane + bus thing
- PQ (specifically near Black Mtn Rd and Carmel Mtn Rd) is a dead spot as far as transit is concerned. The closest bus is over a mile away and has a giant hill inbetween.

--
Kelly Seiler
Electrical Engineer
kelly.seiler@gmail.com
Hi Susanne:

Here is another Mid-Coast corridor question and newsletter subscription.

Thanks!

Katie Lemmon
Planning Assistant I
CityWorks
427 C Street Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92101
T 619 238-9091 X106
F 619 238-6042
E klemmon@cityworks.biz
CityWorks.biz

------ Forwarded Message
From: <jshufelt@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 14 May 2010 12:41:45 -0700
To: <klemmon@cityworks.biz>
Conversation: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com
Subject: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com

Name: Jonathan Shufelt
e mail: jshufelt@gmail.com

Subject: Midcoast Corridor Question from KSDM.com

Subscribe to Midcoast newsletter: on

Question: How will the Mid-Coast Corridor help the current bus routes? I find the some of the park and ride lots are under used in La Jolla/UTC like the one at corner of 5 freeway and Gilman.

------ End of Forwarded Message
Comments on the Mid-Coast Corridor Scoping Document for the SEIR
Pam Epstein [pepstein@sierraclubsandiego.org]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 5:04 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: Mike Bullock - home [mike_bullock@earthlink.net]; Carolyn Chase - home [cdchase@sdearthtimes.net]; Debbie knight [dknight3@san.rr.com]
Attachments: [Comments_for_Mid-Coast_Cor~1.pdf](Open as Web Page)

Please, find attached as a pdf file the aforementioned comments. If there are any problems downloading the document a faxed copy has been sent, as well. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of the comments contained herein.

Best Regards,

Pamela N. Epstein

--
Pamela N. Epstein, Esq., LL.M
Consulting Attorney & Legal Intern Coordinator
Legal Committee, Chair
Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter
8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., Ste 101
San Diego, CA 92111
C: 1.520.904.1482
E: pepstein@sierraclubsandiego.org

*** Please think about the environment before printing this e-mail, thank you.
The San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club appreciates and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR"). The Sierra Club fully supports SANDAG’s efforts to ensure improved mobility and accessibility around centers in the Mid-Coast Corridor in order to support smart growth and economic development within the region. “The purpose of an environmental impact report is to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a project.” Pub. Res. Code § 21061. To achieve a competitive transit system while maintaining the environmental integrity of the region, it is our recommendation that SANDAG draft an SEIR of the highest quality providing both decision-makers and the public a full opportunity to understand and analyze the Project’s environmental repercussions.

Our concerns center on the Project’s lack of cohesion with respect to San Diego County’s current transit infrastructure and SANDAG’s SB375 responsibility to reduce driving and comply with AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, to lower greenhouse gas emissions (“GHG”). The Project fails to provide a holistic approach to solving San Diego County’s transportation problems. The current Project model is fragmented from SANDAG’s GHG reduction responsibilities under SB375, the state’s responsibility to continue to maintain roads with the decreasing gas-tax accounts that will result from Pavely 1 and Pavely 2’s C02-per-mile reduction mandates, and the rest of San Diego’s transportation system. Therefore, the Project model does not take into account a range of other available transportation alternatives and strategies.
SANDAG’s failure to clearly define the concept of a “competitive transit system” also provides an area of contention. What is the barometer upon which competitiveness is measured? In order to comply with the standards set out by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), the SEIR will need to clearly analyze competitive trip times with drive times. It is SANDAG’s duty to engage in a critical examination of the MTS market research, highlighting that San Diegans will only change their trip preferences (from automobiles to mass transit) when transit trip times are competitive with driving times. This should be reflected in the mode change calculations.

Furthermore, in order to meet CEQA obligations, SANDAG must provide an adequate range of alternatives. CEQA requires that an EIR describe alternatives that would feasibly attain the project’s objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s significant impacts. See, Pub. Res. Code § 21100(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(c). For example, noticeably absent from the proposed SEIR is an adequate investigation into alternatives which may identify Bus Rapid Transit (“BRT”) as a competitive alternative to Light Rail Transit (“LTR”). The failure to account for such a competitive alternative leads to an inadequate estimate of ridership comparisons with the trolley. The proposed SEIR also lacks consideration of various other strategies that could reasonably achieve the objective of increased ridership while reducing significant environmental impacts; including but not limited to a necessary reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (“VMT”). Specifically, the proposed SEIR fails to consider the most powerful, short-term, price-constrained strategies to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks, as required by SB375. SANDAG should consider investigating current strategies proposed internationally by the Netherlands (2014), Denmark (2016), and domestically by Nevada (http://www.vmtfeenv.com/), in addition to the strategy fully tested in Oregon.

The proposed SEIR fails to coalesce with the directives outlined by SANDAG’s own Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, “[t]o reduce VMT, MPOs should model adding pricing to existing lanes, not just as a means for additional expansion. Variable/congestion pricing should be considered.” (http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/rtp/2010_RTP_Guidelines.pdf) Similarly, the proposed SEIR fails to model the pricing of parking, even though SANDAG’s own Guidelines, recommends such consideration. Modeling the pricing of driving and parking will increase the cost effectiveness of transit, by greatly increasing ridership.

The proposed SEIR should also contain an alternative that has both the commuter rail option and the LRT or BRT option. The commuter rail option would effectively add a Coaster
stop under the UTC and reduce the Coaster/AMTRAK travel time from the City of Oceanside to
the City of San Diego. It therefore is an alternative that competes with the I-5 expansion. CEQA
requires all environmental impact reports to analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts
pursuant to CEQA sections 15355 and 15358. Hence, it is inadequate that this proposed SEIR
does not identify the simultaneous and linked DEIR on the proposed RTP 2030 I-5 expansion.
This CALTRANS projects has received generous media and public attention and it is incumbent
upon SANDAG staff to be informed about both of the aforementioned projects and to account
for them within their environmental review document.

The commuter rail option is more expensive than the other alternatives in the proposed
SEIR. However, if these two on-going EIR efforts were linked together, as required by law, it
might be found that the commuter rail project could save money by effectively replacing and/or
scaling-back the very expensive I-5 widening project. CEQA requires an EIR to summarize the
main points of disagreement among related issues, in order to ensure good faith efforts at full
compliance. See Pub.Res.Code, §§ 21083, 21061, 2100; See also, San Francisco Ecology Center

Inadequacies of the Proposed SEIR

As previously stated the proposed scope of the SEIR lacks appropriate identification and
investigation into all reasonably feasible alternatives. Under CEQA every EIR must describe a
range of alternatives to a proposed project, and to its location that would feasibly attain the
project’s basic objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s significant
impacts. Pub.Res.Code § 21100(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(a); see Citizens of Goleta
Valley, 52 Cal.3d at 564-65. The court in Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n v. Regents of
University of California, “[w]ithout meaningful analysis of alternatives in the EIR, neither the
courts nor the public can fulfill their proper roles in the CEQA process...[Courts will not]
countenance a result that would require blind trust by the public, especially in light of CEQA’s
fundamental goal that the public be fully informed as to the consequences of action by their
public officials.” 47 Cal.3d 376 at 404. The limited discussion regarding the stated alternatives
is such that the SEIR is incapable of providing the public and decision makers with the necessary
information to comply with CEQA. The law further demands that SANDAG draft a
comprehensive, information document in order for the public to provide decision-makers with
meaningful feedback; therefore there must be full disclosure of all modeling assumptions for each alternative.

The proposed SEIR would fall short of fulfilling CEQA’s mandate of identifying an environmentally superior alternative. CEQA Guidelines§ 15126.6(e)(2). Hence, the SEIR must reevaluate and provide a reasonable range of alternatives that reduce the potential significant environmental impacts. The examples below are illustrative of alternatives that should be analyzed within the SEIR.

None of the alternatives recognize the advantage of BRT to move off the dedicated “rapid transit” guide way directly onto the streets as a means of achieving travel conventionality. For example, BRT buses running on the designated bus lanes have the unique capacity to provide transit service directly to community residents bordering the I-5; specifically to Pacific Beach, Clairemont, La Jolla and University City. BRT buses could also connect to the employment centers of Sorrento Valley, western Mira Mesa and on Miramar Road. The result being that BRT would transport passengers along all of the LRT routes while serving a greater number of individuals who currently use the MTS bus routes within these communities; incentivizing the use of existing mass transit infrastructure translating to a reduction in GHG emissions.

According to an article published by the Energy Policy Initiatives Center at University of San Diego, “reaching the overall 2050 target of reducing the GHGs 80% below 1990 levels will require more aggressive policies from the on-road transportation category.” ([http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghgpolicy/documents/ES_GHG_Policy_On-Road_FINAL.pdf](http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghgpolicy/documents/ES_GHG_Policy_On-Road_FINAL.pdf)). Moreover, the recently adopted CEQA amendments further instruct lead agencies to engage in a thorough analysis of GHG emissions in their environmental review documents and to mitigate the impact of GHGs when applicable in order to achieve AB32 target reductions.

It would also be useful for SANDAG staff to review the Sierra Club’s national policy on the rail/bus controversy at [http://sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/trans.aspx](http://sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/trans.aspx). Of particular importance is the finding that, “walking and bicycling are best, along with electronic communications to reduce trips. Next are buses, minibuses, light rail and heavy rail (as corridor trips increase); electrified wherever feasible. Rail systems are most effective in stimulating compact development patterns, increasing public transit patronage and reducing motor vehicle use. Station access should be provided by foot, bicycle and public transit, with minimal, but full-priced, public parking. Accommodation of pedestrians, bicycles and public transit should be given priority over private automobiles.”
The calculation for User Benefit Hours ("UBH") adds transfer time to switch modes from the Trolley to the BRT at Old Town, which translates into an additional penalty for transfer time from BRT to local buses at the Mid-Coast stations. Correspondingly, LRT riders on the same route are charged only for the one transfer at the Mid-Coast station (this is according to the briefing at the PWG workshop on March 29). The significant discrepancy between baseline calculations for UBH in respect to LRT and BRT is highly prejudicial and the resulting comparative analysis is inherently flawed. In order to satisfy CEQA the SIER must recalculate the UBH for LRT and BRT using a consistent baseline.

The current alternatives analysis is predicated on a “corridor” model that fails to consider integration with the existing bus system. The analysis lacks any modeling which would add necessary shuttle service to adjacent communities and employment centers in order to achieve the objective of transit mobility and encourage smart growth design (other than UCSD and the Golden Triangle region). According to an e-mail from SANDAG staff, the modeling behind the UBH’s values overlay on the existing region’s MTS routes falls short of providing a systematic analysis of the impacts without consideration to the alternatives proposed by the LRT with regard to existing bus feeder routes. If the SEIR is unable, to broaden its range of alternatives in this area, the result will be an insufficient CEQA document. The model will provide an unrealistic result, because once the Mid-Coast system is in place there will be obvious changes to the MTS bus routes that would yield more efficient overall travel.

For example, the MTS grid used in the modeling considered that a transit user in central La Jolla would use the #30 bus to get to Pacific Beach and then the #27 to get to the Balboa Mid-Coast station. An individual traveling to downtown San Diego would incur a third additional penalty in UBH (transfers at Mission and Garnet, Balboa Mid-Coast and Old Town). This aspect of the modeling partly explains why there are such low numbers of Mid-Coast trips initiated in and ending in La Jolla according to the alternatives study.

The BRT alternatives in the proposed model originate from downtown San Diego. Relying on this designation imposes a penalty on riders originating on the Trolley system south of downtown, as they are forced to interchange with the existing Trolley at the Old Town transit center. To support an efficient transit system, utilizing BRT, the SEIR should conduct a model where transfers are designated at Old Town as opposed to the downtown area. Therefore alleviating areas where the BRT must overcome significant traffic congestion, for example Broadway and Pacific Highway.
Lastly, the Project makes no effort to consider an alternative that is convenient for individuals traveling from the south. For example, an individual traveling from Torrey Pines, Del Mar or Mira Mesa would have to park and ride the Trolley to downtown San Diego. This would likely be a common travel problem, similar to today’s problem of going on the I-5 to Old Town, parking and riding the Trolley downtown. As such, the presently proposed alternatives analysis provides no less environmentally damaging alternative while simultaneously failing to achieve the Project’s stated objective of transit mobility and smart growth design. The Project will continue to necessitate transit users to drive to the LRT or BRT transit centers with an unmitigated increase in GHG emissions.

The Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter strongly supports the comments submitted by The Friends of Rose Creek with regard to the proposed extension of the Trolley to the north of Old Town, heading towards north University City along Rose Creek. This area is a one of San Diego’s precious nature resources and we join with The Friends of Rose Creek in recommending that:

1. The Project engage in NO additional channelization, culverting or undergrounding of any stretch of Rose Creek to accommodate the trolley.
2. All mitigation for impacts to the creek south of Highway 52 and north of Santa Fe Street shall be performed within the geographical location where the impacts occur.
3. With respect to mitigation opportunities utilized, those identified by The Rose Creek Watershed Alliance Opportunities Assessment include but are not limited to the following:
   a. Safe and legal railroad crossings to allow residents of University City, Clairemont and Pacific Beach to move freely within these communities on foot and on bicycle (thus, offsetting the Project’s GHGs);
   b. Restoration of any degraded habitats;
   c. Removal of existing concrete culverts/channels where feasible; and
   d. The design and development of new trails to support visitor enjoyment of the area.

Conclusion
It is kindly requested that SANDAG take note of the comments offered throughout this letter, as mandated by CEQA. At this time the Sierra Club would like to again show its support for an effective and efficient holistic approach to increased transit mobility and smart growth design. The comments herein are offered in an effort to achieve SANDAG’s ultimate objective in an environmentally conscious manner. In closing, it is strongly encouraged that every effort be made to fully comply with the letter and spirit of the CEQA.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

Pamela N. Epstein, Esq., LL.M
Chair, Legal Committee
Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter
pepstein@sierraclubsandiego.org
8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., Ste 101
San Diego, CA 92111

With Assistance by, Ashley Welgan

cc:
Carolyn Chase, cdchase@sdearthtimes.net
Mike Bullock, mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Deborah Knight, dknigh3@san.rr.com

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

The San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club is San Diego’s oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization, founded in 1948. Encompassing San Diego and Imperial Counties, the San Diego Chapter seeks to preserve the special nature of the San Diego and Imperial Valley area through education, activism, and advocacy. The Chapter has over 14,000 members. The National Sierra Club has over 700,000 members in 65 Chapters in all 50 states, and Puerto Rico.
-----Original Message-----
From: Laurie Smith [mailto:lgsmith@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 12:25 PM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: midcoast corridor project

Dear SANDAG,

I cannot make it to the public meeting at UCSD on May 11, but I would just like to add my voice to others with tremendous enthusiasm for this project. Connecting UCSD to San Diego Trolley line will be tremendously valuable for our institution and our students', faculty and staff ability to commute without reliance on private cars. Since the campus area that riders will want to access if very large, it would be especially valuable if it’s possible for people to bring bikes on board the tolley and if there is plenty of bike parking at the station (especially if it’s secure bike parking, like a bicycle cage that requires card key access).

Laurie G. Smith
Professor
Section of Cell and Developmental Biology University of California San Diego 9500 Gilman Drive #0116 Rm. 5135 Muir Biology La Jolla, C A92093-0116 lgsmith@ucsd.edu
858-822-2531
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Stefan Llewellyn Smith [mailto:sgls@ucsd.edu] 
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 10:27 AM 
To: Mid Coast 
Cc: Powell Jr. Powell 
Subject: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Period 

I am a faculty member at UCSD. I attended the Scoping Meeting at UCSD last week.

I think the following route would offer a number of advantages. My main concern is that Alternative 1 would cut the loop road around campus. The route below does not.

Cons:
-UCSD/V Astation further from center of campus

Pros:
- doesn't cut campus in 2
- serves V A
- avoids Voigt bridge
- could be combined with Gilman bridge
- avoids Rose Canyon
- has University Town Square station
- has no sharp corners
- avoids environmentally sensitive area between Thornton Hospital and Mesa Housing
- could have access to UCSD/V Astation through V Aparking lot to avoid traffic going through campus

The question of where the UCSD East station should go is open-ended. The location I have picked is just one possibility.

The only real issue is how far the UCSD/V Astation is from the center of campus. I think that given the advantages, the extra distance to the center of campus is an acceptable price to pay. The LRT stays outside the campus loop on West campus.

I hope this is useful.

Stefan Llewellyn Smith
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Conor Soraghan [csoragha@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 6:14 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; ron-roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

PLEASE PROTECT ROSE CANYON AND STOP THE TROLLEY PROPOSAL.
THANK YOU.

Sincerely,
Conor Soraghan,
San Diego, CA 92107
csoragha@hotmail.com
Dear Sandag Officials,

I have reviewed the various alternative routes for the proposed Mid Coast Corridor Transit Project. I favor either alternative 1 or 6. Alternative 3 through Rose Canyon along the railroad tracks should be avoided. I have lived in University City for 30 years and have watched the slow encroachments on this park and on its wildlife. As much as I love the rumble of the freight trains and Coaster, adding another set of tracks with overhead wires for the trolley through Rose Canyon will further diminish our open space and wildlife preserve. Since there are no proposed stops in Rose Canyon, i.e., at Regents Road, there is essentially no benefit to the residents on either side of Rose Canyon--just more traffic through a widened rail corridor. We have lost the once ubiquitous and striking jack rabbits, the howling of coyotes, and the suprise seeing of red and grey foxes from the encroachment of all the houses and condominiums building along the north rim of Rose Canyon over the past 20 years. Surely routing the trolleys along alternative route 6 through Rose Canyon will only exacerbate this wildlife flight from the area. Routes 1 and 6 would serve the same purpose in terms of main transit stops with the main Transit Center at UTC and have none of the additional visual, noise, and space encroachment in Rose Canyon that drive our wildlife out of the area. I heartily support these other two routes. I encourage our county officials and city council members to support either of these two alternatives to the Rose Canyon routing of the trolley.

Sincerely,

James W. Steger, M.D.
6348 Bunche Way
San Diego, CA
Mid coast trolley comment
jhsteinbach@ucsd.edu [jhsteinbach@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 12:57 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

It will be very crowded where the tracks go under highway 52.

Maintain the wildlife corridor that goes all the way to Mission Bay; bicycle and pedestrian paths; storm water conveyance; and vehicular access to maintain sewers, fiber-optic cable, and other utilities. Take advantage of MWWD's low impact vehicles.

Do not underground the creek. Keep stormwater and wild life path.

Joseph H. Steinbach
Hello,

Please do not run the trolley route through Rose Canyon. We think the I-5 to UCSD (LRT 1) route a much better choice. It is certainly less damaging to our communities remaining natural environment. We use the canyon several times a week for exercise and a bit of peace at the end of the day. PLEASE don't run anymore transportation corridors through Rose Canyon.

Thank you, Esther Barath & Phel Steinmetz

8460-44 Via Sonoma

La Jolla, CA 92037
Alternative Plan
Matthew Stucky [stucky@lbbslaw.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 11:11 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org

The problem I see with this plan is its almost complete circumvention of any residential areas. For obvious reasons, nobody lives next to the 5 freeway. I currently live in Pacific Beach and work downtown. I would love to be able to take the Trolley to work but this plan places the station on the eastern side of the 5 freeway, which wouldn’t be convenient at all. It is also at the bottom of a huge hill such that Clairemont residents would likewise not benefit from the station. Effectively, this plan seems to connect UCSD and University City with downtown while avoiding everything in between.

The alternative, although admittedly more radical, plan that I would suggest: from Old Town, run out Sports Arena Blvd. to Ingraham Street. Continue on Ingraham St. to Garnet and turn east. Placing a station at Ingraham and Garnet would place public transit without walking distance to almost the entire population of Pacific Beach. Continue on Garnet and up Balboa Ave to Genesee. Then turn north on Genesee and continue into University City as planned. I would envision stations at Sports Arena, Sea World, Ingraham and Garnet, Balboa and the Freeway, Balboa and Clairement, Balboa and Genessee, Clairemont Mesa and Genessee, and then the currently planned stations.

Such a route would place tens of thousands of people within walking distance of a transit line. Sea World and the Sports Arena would be accessible. Students in Pacific Beach could travel to both UCSD and SDSU without driving. Residents of Pacific Beach and Clairemont could commute to University City and downtown. I can honestly say that with such a line, I could travel 90% of the time without using a car: I would be connected to work downtown and shopping in Sports Arena, Mission Valley, and UTC. Such a plan could also serve to revitalize Clairemont if higher density development was included along the transit corridor. This plan would revolutionize the entire area.

Of course, it would cost more and disrupt areas since easy transit corridors do not exist. Ideally, it seems an elevated line could work. I would imagine that such a line would drastically reduce traffic such that the loss of a traffic lane, if necessary, would not disrupt traffic flow.

Please consider this plan: it’s admittedly not as easy, it would definitely cost more, but it would actually be useful to residents. If we’re going to spend the money, let’s do it in a way that makes this area of San Diego truly public-transit-friendly. Such a route would drastically change this area of San Diego for the better.

Matt Stucky
I would love to see the trolley extended to reach Kearny Mesa. At our organization alone more than 50 people would use it regularly. Thanks for your consideration.

Kim
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,
Mike T
San Diego, CA 92122
From: Timothy Treadwell [mailto:timothy.treadwell@energycenter.org]
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2010 1:32 PM
To: Mid Coast
Subject: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Scoping Period

The Kearny Mesa section of San Diego drastically needs access to the trolley. It is full of corporate office parks with little to no mass transit options. Extending service to this portion of San Diego could reduce freeway traffic and increase ridership.

Thank you,
Tim Treadwell
I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Sam Tsimikas 2802 arnoldson ave SD 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I Strongly oppose with the possibility of having the trolley run through any part of Rose Canyon. I would like to request that you delete this route from any further consideration. Please look into alternate routes that won't impose any environmental threats to the little bit that we have preserved. This route will Rose Canyon Park in many ways. This is a place where families & children can enjoy the natural beauty, natural wildlife, where we can picnic, hike, bike field trips Scouting adventure and much more. Being a resident for over 30 years and watching the urban development grow and grow I have witnessed a huge loss of natural habitats which I would like to preserve this area as a long and lasting natural park so that future generations can see and enjoy what this regions quality of life really is.

Thank You

Lauren Underwood

7191 Whipple Ave. San Diego, Ca. 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Vazakas
2924 Honors Court
San Diego, CA 92122
(858) 457-4067
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
swebber [swebber@san.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:54 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear Legislator...

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the idea of running
the trolley through Rose Canyon (the LRT3 option). I urge you to
select the LRT 1 route that continues along I 5 to UCSD even though
this route will lead to adverse effects on the canyon at its western
end. Running the light rail system right through the canyon as in the
LRT3 concept, however will be infinitely more damaging and will
devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park. We have so few open spaces
left within our city and I urge you to be responsible in working to
conserve it. The park enhances the quality of life for many of us, it
is beautiful and full of wildlife.

Sincerely
Stephanie Webber
Resident of University City
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

William Whalen

2555 Curie Place
San Diego CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Sandiegowolfe@aol.com [Sandiegowolfe@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 7:34 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

From John Wolfe: 4265 Caminito Cassis near Regents Rd on Rose Canyon.
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee  
Peter Worcester [pworcester@ucsd.edu]

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 11:32 AM  
To: midcoast@sandag.org  
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov; Peter F. Worcester [pworcester@ucsd.edu]; Donna S. Worcester [dworcester@ucsd.edu]

To Whom It May Concern:

We strongly support improving the mass transit system in San Diego. We cannot afford, either economically or environmentally, to keep adding lanes to our freeways.

Nonetheless, we strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). Our canyons are among the jewels of San Diego, helping make our city one of the most attractive in the country. For far too long, however, we have treated our canyons as little more than routes for freeways and opportunities to build more condos and shopping centers. It is time that we appreciate and preserve the contributions made by our canyons to the beauty and livability of San Diego. We moved to San Diego in 1970, when Mission Valley was largely still open space. We would be the envy of every city in the country if we had had the foresight to preserve Mission Valley as parkland. Instead, all that we have is sprawl that is the envy of no one. No one in their right mind would want to stay in Hotel Circle, overlooking a multilane freeway, if they knew what it is really like.

We urge you to delete the LRT 3 route through Rose Canyon from any further consideration in the environmental study. We urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Peter and Donna Worcester
4624 Robbins Street
San Diego, CA 92122
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Pamela Wu

3975 Cmto Cassis

San Diego CA 92122
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Dorit Yates [dorityates@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 4:27 PM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dear council,

strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely,

Dorit Yates
No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee
Ken Young [punkdunks@hotmail.com]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 6:08 AM
To: midcoast@sandag.org
Cc: sherrilightner@sandiego.gov; Ron-Roberts@sdcounty.ca.gov

Please preserve the natural beauty of not only this canyon, but all canyon's in SD county. If you grew up here you have to understand the part they play in our county's natural beauty and what they hold for our children's future.

Thank You,

Ken -Denise- Sarah- Elizabeth Young
4331 Miami Ct.
San Diego, Ca. 92117
To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.

The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. Forty-five hundred students from across San Diego attend the four schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.

Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life.

Sincerely, Victor Zhukov
To Whom It May Concern:

The choice of routing a loud and obtrusive trolley and its' multiple encumberments through Rose Canyon would be a serious mistake in judgment, in my opinion. It would permanently damage the careful efforts of many in the community to save a piece of our natural setting. An uninspired answer is to just go ahead and homogenize this community and its characterful canyon to the same growth solutions used with so much of Southern California. The result is the inability to recognize any place from any other as they are all the same. The guiding value of accommodating future growth should not be the only value in which to make this decision. We have a chance to save this special and lovely spot but it will take wisdom and vision. Please run it along the already developed section going to UCSD. (LRT1) Please help us........................................

Sincerely,
Barbara Zirino
4261 Karensue Ave
SD 92122
858 450 7124
May 31, 2010

Ms. Leslie Blanda
Mid-Coast Comments, Draft SEIS/SEIR
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92010

RE:  Mid-Coast Trolley Project

Dear Ms. Blanda,

As a homeowner in the area of the proposed trolley project, I would like to provide input on the trolley project, the project purpose and need, and issues to be studied in the environmental document.

As to the project need and/or purpose, this cannot be addressed without some more substantial information on the following points.

I would like the Draft SEIS/SEIR to specifically address ridership models for the trolley extension broken out into at least two riderships levels: Ridership from downtown to a proposed Pacific Beach station and then Ridership to University City. Also, I would like the SEIS/SEIR to provide travel times comparisons from downtown to University Town Center and UCSD using existing express bus transit (routes 30, 50 and 150) versus trolley times. Additionally, I would like a comparison of travel times from Grand Avenue and Mission Blvd. in Pacific Beach to UCSD via the existing Route 30 bus versus a bus to a Pacific Beach trolley stop and to UCSD from there. Finally, I would like a comparison of travel times from Grand Avenue and Mission Blvd. in Pacific Beach to downtown San Diego via the existing Route 30 bus versus a bus to a Pacific
Beach trolley stop and to downtown from there. In order to encourage residents and visitors to utilize public transit, it is imperative to make public transit easy, convenient and quick. Please address how the proposed Trolley will improve the ease of use and shorten the travel times.

In general, existing express bus service is more convenient than taking a bus and a trolley. Specifically, the choice to take one bus versus the need to transfer impacts my choice on taking public transit or driving. Therefore, I would like the transit models to specifically address wasted rider time in transferring and in missed connections, which are very frequent especially late in the evening at the Old Town Transit Center. If there are plans to address this issue as part of this project, they should be elaborated upon in the DEIR/DEIS. Furthermore, when evaluating my transposition options, the ability to perform work in transit is one of the key factors in choosing public transit. However, every transfer reduces my work time and therefore my desire to take public transit. Please address how travel time will be minimized and work time maximize when using the trolley. Specifically, the study should indicate total travel time and total work time assuming work is performed on a laptop computer.

As a large number of public transit patrons in Pacific Beach use combinations of bicycle and bus transit to commute to work, I would like the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address how connections would be made and what steps the project is considering to maximize the combination of bus and bicycle commutes.

The proposed Pacific Beach station is located just south of Balboa Avenue and just east of Interstate 5. This location is extremely dangerous to reach by foot and by bicycle from Pacific Beach and Clairemont. The Draft SEIS/SEIR should address improvements in the area to facilitate trolley patrons walking to the station from either North Clairmont or East Pacific Beach.

The intersection of Garnet Avenue and Mission Bay
Drive is an extremely congested, dangerous and difficult to get through intersection for pedestrians and bicyclists. In the last few years, a number of pedestrians have been hit at this intersection and a few have been killed. Given the heavy vehicle traffic at this intersection and it’s danger to non-motorized traffic, I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR address not only how this intersection could be made safe for people trying to get to the trolley station, but also the expense in doing so and to identify and properties that would need to be acquired as part of this project. Furthermore, even Pacific Beach residents taking a bus to the trolley are subjected to significant traffic congestion and delays in reaching the trolley station. Please address how bus transit will be able to bypass the traffic back up on weekday mornings and most any weekend during the summer to reach the trolley station in an expedited manner.

Balboa Avenue has limited sidewalks and a very narrow bike lane. The draft SEIS/SEIR should address improvements in this area including but not limited to non-motorized movement under Interstate 5 along Balboa Avenue without any negative impacts to the native trees growing in the Balboa Avenue median strip. Additional considerations would be how to create a grade separated bike route along Balboa, insure that adequate wheelchair accessible sidewalks are available on the north and south side of Balboa Avenue and provide for a safe and legal drop off point for transit patron drop off and pick up.

As many of the patrons traveling to and from Pacific Beach on the trolley will be tourists, I would like all plans for a Pacific Beach trolley stop to address visitor amenities including but not limited to tourist information, transit information, light food and sundries in order to make the tourist experience convenient. Furthermore, I would like details on staffing levels at this trolley station.

I would also like to respectfully request that the Draft SEIR/SEIS address the feasibility of
relocating the proposed Pacific Beach Trolley station south about ¼ mile. This would place it on the east side of I-5 and parallel to the North Mission Bay Drive entrance to Mission Bay Park. A tunnel under Interstate 5 would allow trolley patrons to exist the trolley almost directly into Mission Bay Park. There is a parcel of underutilized property at South East Corner of Mission Bay Drive and Rosewood that would function as an ideal bus turn around for Pacific Beach, could house visitor amenities and avoid the negative impacts of the previously mentioned items.

I oppose the proposed LRT 3 through Rose Canyon and any other routes that travels outside of the existing railroad right of way. I oppose any route through Rose Canyon Open Space Park past the I-5/Gilman Drive off ramp and through any of the parklands of Marian Bear Natural Park.

I respectfully request the Draft SEIS/SEIR provide details for any contour changes to Rose Creek including, but not limited to plans which would move the alignment of the creek, channelize any portion of the creek, underground any section of the creek or its tributaries and impede existing creek flow in any manner. I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR also address the cumulative impacts for other projects proposed for the area when considering the potential impacts of the trolley. These include but are not limited to California High Speed Rail, Amtrak/Coaster improvements, and proposed bridges in the area. Rose Creek is a California impaired water body and therefore I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR identify opportunities for improving water quality in areas along the rail right of way in a manner that increases habitat diversity, minimizes the spread of non-native species of plants and animals and increase wildlife corridors in the area.

All mitigation opportunities for work performed adjacent to Rose Creek south of Highway 52 and north of Santa Fe Street needs to be performed in this stretch of the creek including the impacts of construction and ongoing maintenance of the
trolley and we request the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address this issue. I strongly urge SANDAG to find an alignment that results in a zero loss to existing parks.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR should also address funding for, implementation of and maintenance of items in the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance Opportunities Assessment, which was accepted as a guidance document for planning in the Rose Creek Watershed by the San Diego City Council in 2008 and is available at [http://rosecreekwatershed.org/](http://rosecreekwatershed.org), including, but not limited to:

Ø New trails to support visitor enjoyment of the area
Ø Safe and legal track railroad track crossings to allow residents of University City, Clairemont and Pacific Beach to move freely within these communities on foot and bicycle.
Ø Restoration of currently degraded habitat and removal of concrete impediments where feasible to allow a more natural wetland habitat to thrive.

I want to insure that no degradation to the Rose Canyon Bike Path is a result of ANY transportation projects in the area. This is one of the most heavily used bike paths in the county and serves as a major non-motorized transportation corridor. Therefore, I specifically request that the Draft SEIS/SEIR address aesthetic, visual and noise related impacts to the user experience on the Rose Canyon Bike Path. I am highly concerned that the Rose Canyon Bike Path is going to end up between a freeway and a trolley. Currently, the ride provides users the ability to look out through a natural landscape and see nothing but trees, grasses and coastal sage scrub habitat. Please identify how you will mitigate the loss of this recreational use.

These comments are strictly my own and do not represent the views of opinions of any organization of which I am a member.

Karin Zirk
2686 Hornblend Street
San Diego CA 92109
858-405-7503
Please extend the trolley to Kearny Mesa. So many people work in this area and it is incredible how long it would take to get from North Park to Kearny Mesa considering how close they are in miles.

Please extend the trolley to the AIRPORT and to Ocean Beach. Why in the world doesn’t the trolley extend to the airport? This will cut down on A LOT of traffic, and it will bring San Diego into the 21st century.

The traffic getting into and out of Ocean Beach is ridiculous. How hard would it be to extend the trolley along the 8, just like it extends all the way out to SDSU? Please extend the trolley to OB.

Thank you!

Cynthia Zulick
Associate Marketing Manager
8690 Balboa Ave, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123-1502
858.244.7294 phone
858.244.7289 fax
www.energycenter.org web

Learn the latest in clean energy developments.
Subscribe to Energy Connection today!
Meeting Summary

Date: May 28, 2010
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Location: Phone Conversation

Participants:

Greg Gastelum
SANDAG
(619) 699-7378
ggas@sandag.org

Nancy McLaughlin
8370 F Via Sonoma
La Jolla, CA 92037
(858) 452-7219
Fax (858) 452-7219

The following summary provides highlights of discussions and action items covered in a phone

1. DISCUSSION TOPICS
   ▪ Confirmed SANDAG will mail a colored snapshot from the video presentation of alternatives
     located at www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast of LRT Alternative 1 crossing over I-5.
   ▪ Clarified scoping comments would be received through June 1, 2010. Nancy requested that the
     following comments be considered:
     1. Requested project map shown on web site be revised to clarify the LRT alignment
        for alternative 1 is not located on west side of I-5 until it crosses the freeway near the
        La Jolla Village Shopping mall.
     2. Recommended that the video presentation of alternatives be included in meeting
        presentations to community groups. Also would like the speed of the video to be
        slowed down and a narrative added so additional details such as proximity of
        alignment to freeway right-of-way, structures, etc. could be shared.
     3. Interested in planning infrastructure improvements before selection of a transit
        alternative for the Mid-Coast project.

Prepared by: Greg Gastelum 5/28/10
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 699-1900 • FAX (619) 699-1905 • www.sandag.org

TO: Nancy McLaughlin
8370 F Via Sonoma
La Jolla, CA 92037

RE: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

☐ Report ☐ Maps ☒ Printouts ☐ Plots ☐ Computer Tape
☐ Diskette ☐ Invoice ☐ Copy of Letter ☐ Memo ☐ Information
☐ CD ☐ Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF COPIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION (Date of material)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Color copy of frame taken from aerial video presentation on SANDAG web site - Light Rail Transit Alternative 1 crossing over I-5 (5-28-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THese ARE TRANSMITTED
☒ As requested ☐ For approval ☐ For review & comment ☐ For action ☐ For your information
☐ Make corrections noted ☐ Amend & resubmit ☐ Other

PLEASE NOTE
Nancy,

Attached is a copy of the Light Rail Transit Alternative 1 at Interstate 5 taken from the aerial video presentation of the proposed alternatives being considered for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project presented on the SANDAG web site located at: www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast.

CC: 

By: Greg Gastelum
Phone: (619) 699-7378
E-Mail: ggastelum@sandag.org

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT
☒ Not requested
☐ Please call upon receipt Received by: 
☐ Please return signed & dated copy Date: 

COPIES: Project File
Phone Message
May 21, 2010
Jason Swanson
858-755-8479

Directed to EIR on the Web site and discussed anticipated schedule for draft EIR, final EIR, construction, completion
Esther Yarborough
619-574-6484
May 20, 2010

Couldn’t make Clairemont Scoping Meeting so wanted to leave a comment. Transit rider who supports trolley extension to La Jolla. “Move heaven and earth” to get the money and build it. Can’t wait for trolley.
## APPENDIX F COMMENT DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Include BRT alternatives in the EIR/EIS. TransNet ballot measure language includes consideration of this mode. BRT alternatives must be fairly evaluated.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The LRT alternatives do not improve services north of UCSD, nor do they provide congestion relief for traffic traveling northbound to the Golden Triangle.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Analyze at least one alternative with major trip times that are competitive with the auto. Lacking this, people will continue to drive to job centers in the Golden Triangle and public investment won't perform as well.</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>For the analysis of alternatives, please disclose all assumptions and make the modeling software available for public use.</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Organization strongly opposes LRT Alternative 3 through Rose Canyon. Right-of-way created in different era, when increased growth was not considered.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>We cannot continue to sacrifice our remaining natural areas to intrusive infrastructure. Infrastructure in major metropolitan areas must go underground or above grade.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Add a multi-modal alternative, combining: removal of LOSSAN curve via underground station at UTC, with necessary double-tracking, and portion of BRT Alternative 3 terminating at UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Organization urges the addition of two BRT alternatives to the EIR/EIS. TransNet ballot measure language includes consideration of this mode.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>BRT Alternative 3 would provide superior services to the VA Hospital.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>A new BRT alternative: turns east on Nobel Drive to UTC, then follows LRT Alternative 3 route to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Consider a BRT expansion project to Sorrento Mesa.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>It is essential that transit be designed from a marketing perspective in order to attract drivers out of their cars by making travel times competitive with driving times.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Please provide the definition of &quot;user benefit hours&quot; and how it was calculated for the different alternatives.</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Please provide the other modeling assumptions made in estimating the costs and cost effectiveness, daily new transit trips, daily new transit boardings, and annual user benefits (hours).</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The FTA defines Transportation System User Benefits (TSUBs) as a New Starts metric. What are the TSUBs for the alternatives?</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>It is our understanding that the project must also compete with other measures of environmental justice. What are these measures and how were they analyzed for the alternatives?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>This project would use more than $600 million of local sales tax revenue. Given the recent millions of dollars in cuts to the transit system, wouldn't system-wide improvements be a better investment?</td>
<td>Costs, Financial</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The loss of hundreds of millions of dollars of planned state transit funding is a significant changed condition and actions should be made to replace those funds to make a difference for users throughout the transit system.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Carolyn Chase</td>
<td>4/29/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Funding currently thought to be reserved for freeway expansion could be used. To reduce GHG emissions consistent with SB 375, AB 32, and Pavley 1, we must adopt policies now that will reduce San Diego net VMT.</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gary Cottrell</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No stops in University City or Clairemont, which is where many people going to UCSD would be coming from. Couldn't there be a stop at Jutland Dr. and SR 52?</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>David Keenan</td>
<td>4/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Like the ideas for service, especially those that go up Gilman and through UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>David Keenan</td>
<td>4/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Why not run an all-day frequent bus route along the corridor, including the underserved Pacific Beach to University City corridor, which requires an hour through Downtown La Jolla or three routes with uncoordinated transfers?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ellis Krauss</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Why aren’t you hooking the trolley north to the Sorrento Valley train station? That way, UCSD employees who live in North County could take the COASTER to Sorrento Valley and then transfer to the trolley. The current shuttle to UCSD is a real inhibitor for UCSD employees to use the COASTER.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ellis Krauss</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The current bus shuttle from the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station to UCSD is a real inhibitor for UCSD employees to use the COASTER.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ellis Krauss</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>If the trolley connected Sorrento Valley to UCSD, I might start using the COASTER and the trolley to commute to work. Why no extension to the COASTER station?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jonathan Lin</td>
<td>5/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Strongly prefer LRT Alt 1. The stop west of I-5 near Nobel Dr and Villa La Jolla Dr would reduce traffic caused by the two large adjacent shopping centers.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jonathan Lin</td>
<td>5/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend the trolley to connect with Amtrak near UCSD. Many UCSD people use Amtrak, but have to travel to Solana Beach. An intermodal station between Amtrak and the trolley in the UTC area would reduce traffic caused by UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I support the proposed LRT concept/route from Old Town to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>South of SR 52, bicyclists and walkers currently have to cross the railroad tracks to get from the dead end Santa Fe St to the Marian Bear Memorial Park trail, as there is no route. Provide a pedestrian bridge or tunnel over or under all the tracks.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Provide a path from the Marian Bear Memorial Park trail to Balboa Ave.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Provide environmental remediation to Rose Creek south of SR 52, as it is badly needed.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Provide a layout and plan for the Balboa Ave Station that could be compatible with redevelopment in the area, including large parking garage/area.</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Robert Little</td>
<td>5/6/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>This railway could be the backbone of major redevelopment for the adjacent Clairemont and Pacific Beach areas (note: see attachment of redevelopment suggestions).</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gretchen Pelletier</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support trolley to UCSD. Will not be able to drive to work, due to recent diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Elizabeth Santillanez</td>
<td>4/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Commuters employed in the La Jolla/University City area would benefit if trolley is expanded from Old Town to University City.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Elizabeth Santillanez</td>
<td>4/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Hope the project is successful. It could improve public transit in San Diego County and reduce auto use and polluting emissions.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kim Sykes</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to Kearny Mesa. At our organization 50+ people would use it.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tim Treadwell</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to Kearny Mesa. This area drastically needs access to the trolley, as it is full of corporate office parks with little to no transit options. The extension to Kearny Mesa would reduce freeway traffic and increase ridership.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to Kearny Mesa. There is a lot of employment in the area and travel time to the area is high.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to airport.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to Ocean Beach.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Why doesn't trolley extend to the airport? This would cut down on a lot of traffic and modernize San Diego.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Traffic getting into and out of Ocean Beach is ridiculous.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Cynthia Zulick</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Extend trolley to Ocean Beach. How hard would it be to extend the trolley along I-8, just like it extends all the way out to SDSU?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Laurie Smith</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Would like to add my voice to others with tremendous enthusiasm for this project.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Laurie Smith</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Connecting UCSD to trolley will be tremendously valuable for UCSD and will increase the ability of UCSD students, faculty, and staff to commute to campus without having to rely on private autos.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Laurie Smith</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Since the UCSD campus is large, it would be valuable if riders were allowed to bring bikes on the trolley.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Laurie Smith</td>
<td>4/26/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Would be valuable if plenty of bike parking is provided at UCSD stations (especially if it is secure bike parking, like a bicycle cage, that requires card key access).</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kelly Houston</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am for extending trolley from Old Town to University City.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dan Hallin</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support extension of trolley north, through UCSD in particular.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dan Hallin</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>UCSD campus is unusual in the way it is isolated from the community of San Diego. Would be good for students to have more ability to access other parts of the city, and to do so without having a car.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Dan Hallin</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>In general, San Diego needs a lot more public transportation.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>David Krysl</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Support LRT Alt 1. More people would take the trolley than the other alternatives.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>David Krysl</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Would add a station at the VA Medical Center.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ken Sinclair</td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Need to think about a pedestrian bridge across I-5 to Mission Bay and other places in that area.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ken Sinclair</td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>More public art along the trolley stations.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Angelica Aguilar</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>As a UCSD student with no car, it can be very difficult for me to get around San Diego. I have to commute at least 1.5 hours to get to Ocean Beach on a weekday.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Angelica Aguilar</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>A trolley to the UCSD area would be fantastic for future students or those looking to visit UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Angelica Aguilar</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Extended hours for all transit would be fantastic. Extended hours on the weekends would be an amazing addition to the project.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>David Conart</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Light rail is an exciting move but concerned about the location of the possible route through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>David Conart</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>The environmental effects of the project need to be a greater consideration.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Connect to the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Go through (provide more service to) the Nobel Dr area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>A &quot;S&quot; shape reaching the COASTER is much better (note: see map). If you reach the COASTER, people in Sorrento Valley can access UCSD much easier. &quot;COASTER access is very important.&quot;</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 1 - LRT Alt 1 is not optimal. Too noisy on UCSD campus, misses UCSD residential area on Nobel Dr., and no COASTER connection. LRT Alt 1 is not satisfactory.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Elizabeth Elman</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - Excited that light rail will be coming to UCSD, connecting the campus with the rest of San Diego.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Elizabeth Elman</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Concerned about the LRT route that would go through Rose Canyon. Route would unnecessarily threaten one of the few remaining natural habitats in San Diego for no real ridership increase or cost decrease.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Larry Hogue</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - Excited to have trolley come to University City. It will be great to walk or bike to UTC or Nobel Dr and take the trolley to downtown.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Larry Hogue</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The trolley shouldn't go through Rose Canyon Open Space Park to Genesee Ave. This will further degrade this precious open space area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Larry Hogue</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Support LRT Alt 1. This alternative better serves the UCSD population, with a stop at Nobel Dr. It also comes close to the employment centers near SAIC.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Helen Leung</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>I have no problems with this project.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Helen Leung</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Be mindful of the low-income neighborhoods that may be negatively affected.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Helen Leung</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Think about how you can make UCSD more accessible to communities of color in San Diego.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The orange route &quot;LRT Alt 3&quot;, which travels through undisturbed habitat, should be avoided.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - The red route is my first and best choice. Service to Preuss School is of utmost importance, as it serves many students that currently ride buses, which consume a lot of fuel and generate emissions.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Service along Nobel Dr would benefit many UCSD students.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>The current 150 bus route serves my needs except for the fact that service ends at 7 p.m.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - This LRT would serve members of the community better by providing access to the UTC shopping center.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Carol Schwenke</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>The I-5 corridor should be utilized but not widened towards the west, which could jeopardize the stability of Mt. Soledad.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Shelley Plumb</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Route the trolley up I-5 from Old Town, with a stop at Nobel and then onto the UCSD campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Shelley Plumb</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - You must not take the trolley through beautiful Rose Canyon Open Space Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Shelley Plumb</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Within Rose Canyon, the hillsides have beautiful scenic flowers. One can hear the bees buzzing and birds singing. It is a peaceful, serene setting in the middle of University City. Yes, one can hear the occasional train, but not very often.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Shelley Plumb</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Having the trolley roll through the canyon every 15 minutes would destroy the beauty of Rose Canyon Open Space Park. Please don't take away this precious resource for the people of San Diego.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Brian Chow</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Don't go through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Brian Chow</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Have the trolley use I-5 instead of Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Brian Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Support the idea of extending the trolley from Old Town, for the overall common good of the communities that the new line will service.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Brian Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>All the routes have been carefully considered with regard to cost and minimal impacts to the environment. Either of the proposed trolley routes are equally good.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Thank goodness the trolley is coming north of I-8.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Don't like yellow alternative because it goes through Rose Canyon and requires tunneling.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Like the red alternative because it appears to service more residents and businesses in the area. It could have another stop added to ensure connectivity with the SuperLoop.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Could be a stop at Costco too, as there are several adjacent businesses that have no other transit options.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>D. Jones</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Too bad no connection to the COASTER. Project should ensure finding for a connector shuttle, so that UTC business employees can connect to COASTER for points north.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Rachel Lichterman</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Prefer LRT Alt 1, as it is cost effective and connects population to downtown.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Rachel Lichterman</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Consider expanding trolley route farther north to help decrease traffic.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Rachel Lichterman</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Routes through UCSD East Campus are less effective in cutting rush hour traffic because students generally live close to campus or can utilize UCSD shuttles. UCSD West Station should suffice.</td>
<td>Stations, General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Rachel Lichterman</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Strongly vote for LRT Alt 1, with stop in front of Scripps Memorial Hospital.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Melissa Maigler</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I would vote for LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Melissa Maigler</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>If get the trolley to the furthest point north, you would have a much higher chance of people in the Mira Mesa corporate district taking the trolley and either biking or taking a bus the remainder of the way to work.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vikram Subramanya</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Keep the cost per ride affordable.</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Vikram Subramanya</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Give monthly/quarterly pass to students.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Nancy Taylor</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - The trolley extension is a much-needed project in a heavily-populated area. Thank you for extending another public transit alternative to this community.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Patricia Robertson</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Concerned about how the trolley (note: Jutland Dr Station) will effect my neighborhood. I heard that there may be a stop at Jutland Dr and Morena Blvd. We already have a homeless encampment near the railroad tracks. Wont this bring more homeless into my neighborhood? What about foot traffic into my neighborhood?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Michael Beck</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Offer support of LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Michael Beck</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Voice opposition to LRT Alt 3.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Michael Beck</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - LRT Alt 1 provides a direct link to UCSD, La Jolla Village Square, and UTC, nodes that will provide the highest ridership and system efficiencies without the significant community and biological impacts of LRT Alt 3 through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Michael Beck</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - LRT Alt 3 would have significant community and biological impacts through Rose Canyon and does not link directly to UCSD, an essential node.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Steven Higgins</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Like idea of trolley coming to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Steven Higgins</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Prefer LRT Alts 1 &amp; 6. To make it ridable for me, want trolley to go to UCSD campus before UTC, if going northbound.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Steven Higgins</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Would like to see better accommodations for cyclists, as it would be ideal for me to take the trolley to work and ride bike home.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Steven Higgins</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Having two stops at UCSD would help those times I need to get to Thornton Hospital.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Steven Higgins</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Would not use if LRT Alt 3 is chosen.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Stefan L. Smith</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Concerned LRT Alt 1 would cut the loop road around campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes , Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Stefan L. Smith</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Suggested route (note: see map) would not cut the loop road around campus. Additionally: it doesn't cut campus in two; serves the VA Medical Center; avoids Voigt bridge, Rose Canyon, and enviro sensitive area south of Thornton Hospital; could be combined with Gilman bridge; has station at La Jolla Village Square; no sharp corners; and, could have access to UCSD/VA station through VA parking lot to avoid traffic going through campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Stefan L. Smith</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Location of UCSD East Station is open-ended. The location I have picked (note: see map) is just one possibility.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Stefan L. Smith</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Only real issue is how far the suggested new UCSD/VA Station (note: see map) is from the center of campus. Given the advantages, the extra distance to center of campus is acceptable. The LRT would stay outside of the campus loop on UCSD West Campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Frank Powell Jr.</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Propose a new LRT alternative (note: see map). This alternative doesn't go through the middle of the UCSD campus and satisfies the same demands as LRT Alt 1 for hospitals, schools, employers/businesses, and shopping centers. Variation of LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Frank Powell Jr.</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I understand that initial input from UCSD students was that they wanted a stop as close as possible to the center of campus. However, any above ground route with a central stop will isolate part of the campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Frank Powell Jr.</td>
<td>5/18/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>My proposed UCSD/VA Station would provide easy access for VA Hospital patients, which is more justifiable than the UCSD West Station that would bring young, able-bodied students closer to the bookstore.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Andrew Leeper</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 3 - LRT Alt 3 is the best choice because it allows future expansion of the line to the Del Mar Fairgrounds, which would provide parking relief for UCSD and would benefit travelers from the south going to the fairgrounds.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Andrew Leeper</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The problem with LRT Alt 1 is that it creates a hook that makes it hard to expand northward. Understand the transit board has wanted to make northern Golden Triangle a &quot;second downtown&quot; for San Diego, turning the hook of LRT Alt 1 into a full loop, in order to run lines off of in the future - not a good idea, unnecessary.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Andrew Leeper</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Perhaps another line branching off of the proposed, continuing to follow the current rail line eastward towards Miramar, breaking off at the base, and then turning northward toward the North County Fair Shopping Center and SD Wild Animal Park would be a good line addition. Any more than that would not be as successful.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Andrew Leeper</td>
<td>5/13/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Trolley is good compliment to car, but not a full replacement of it. Not a panacea for all transportation needs. Needed to connect high traffic destination points (with alternative drop off points), to relieve congestion and parking. Needed for those without a car and for foreign travelers. Supporter of project, as it is a big part of transportation solution for the future.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Is there going to be shuttle service between the station and the VA Medical Center? Concerned for me and my fellow vets, like the guys in the wheelchairs. If it is going to be two or three blocks, it won't be of any value to them. Also, to see availability. Is it going to be to the VA Medical Center for us vets?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Think LRT Alt 1 is the best. It would get the most ridership from students and riders in the UCSD area. Figure shoppers wouldn't mind waiting a few more minutes. Students are a little more in a hurry. Would be the greatest benefit.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Support LRT - For me, any one of these would work.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Think LRT Alt 1 would work the best. Serve the students first. Shoppers could wait a few extra minutes. People who live in UCSD area, traveling southbound to downtown for work, are a little bit better at managing their time.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Marilyn Ames</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>In order for SD to truly have a mass transit system, the bus system must be expanded to support the trolley system. Many neighborhoods don't have convenient access to the bus lines. Also, bus and trolley stops need to have convenient/adequate parking for cars.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>John Coxe</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Concerned with potential noise and crime impacts in the Balboa/Morena area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Gine Dobey</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I have great concern about the potential for added noise and impact on the Rose Canyon area if LRT Alt 3 is selected. Consider carefully.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hill</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - LRT Alt 1 is absolutely the best choice for the trolley route.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hill</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Regarding traffic in University City, the need for the completion of the Regents Road bridge is sorely needed. Genesee Ave is not able to provide adequate escape during fire or earthquake. It is blocked in am and pm by commuters, creating a parking lot atmosphere. Fire engines, ambulances, police cars cannot respond to calls. The high school adds to congestion. Pedestrians risk lives when crossing Genesee Ave/Governor Dr.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Sam Ames</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Will bus schedules be coordinated with trolley schedules?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Sam Ames</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Can you accommodate parking for commuters? How? Especially the Balboa Ave Station.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Sam Ames</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>What are the incentives for people to leave their cars and take the trolley? Reduced monthly rates? Eco friendly? Easy transfer from bus to trolley? Other?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Margaret Schmidt</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>The Executive Dr Station seems redundant (so close to both UTC and UCSD East Stations). The money spent on this station seems like it would be better spent on increasing the walkability of the area from both of the other stations.</td>
<td>Costs, Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Margaret Schmidt</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Pedestrian friendly concepts need to be incorporated in development of each of the stations since most are not located in high density residential areas.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Margaret Schmidt</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Has there been communication with Sea World about them providing a shuttle circuit to and from the Tecolote Station? This would make so much sense and increase the usefulness of the station since at present there are limited potential users.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Esther Yarborough</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Support LRT - Transit rider who supports trolley extension to La Jolla. &quot;Move heaven and earth&quot; to get the money and build it. Can't wait for trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Financial, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Robert Byrnes</td>
<td>5/23/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Do not route a trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT Alt.3). Urge you to delete route from further consideration. Enjoy hiking in Rose Canyon weekly. A trolley would ruin the experience by making it visually unappealing and noisy, further degrading the quality of the peaceful and restful area of our community.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>David Krysl</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the project.</td>
<td>Public involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Dave Strom</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Add me to your list to receive updates via e-mail on the project.</td>
<td>Public involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Jason Swanson</td>
<td>5/21/2010</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Directed to EIR on the website and discussed anticipated schedule for draft EIR, final EIR, construction, completion</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Jerry Selness</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The Balboa Avenue Station is a good one.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Jerry Selness</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The Tecolote Road Station is a good one.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Jerry Selness</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The Clairemont Drive Station is useless. People wanting to access this station could use either the Balboa Avenue or Tecolote Road Stations. This station would have fewer people.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Jerry Selness</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>You would get a lot of people at this station (note: either the Balboa Avenue or Tecolote Road Station).</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>About the station, provide adequate parking because there is no other way to get this for people who live up in La Mesa.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>For LRT Alt 3, the below grade alignment along Genesee Avenue, I don't think that will go. It is too bad, but it just won't go. It would really be a mess.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>I mean, if you can go this way and that way and come back this way and that way, that is enough (note: suggested route unclear).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>LRT Alt 3 - LRT Alt 3, which requires undergrounding, is a mess.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Support LRT - I think it is really the thing to do. We would probably use it.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Public transportation should be cheaper. For the first couple of years, it should be free, so that people get used to using it.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Part of the money that goes to Caltrans should go to this, instead of having more lanes on the freeway. We need to spend more money on the trolley and buses.</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>There should be smaller buses for handicap people, especially to get us from home to trolley and back. Smaller buses could also be used to bring people up from Pacific Beach to the trolley, which will cut down on the traffic.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>We are far behind other cities in public transportation. We really need to get on the ball.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>If there was a Balboa Ave Station, my caregiver, who lives in Lemon Grove, would use the trolley every day.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Ruth Crowell</td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>If the trolley is more expensive than driving, my caregiver, who doesn't make much money, may not use it. Trolley should be priced fairly for people to really use it.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/10</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Consider light rail to the COASTER Sorrento Valley Station. Whenever I ride Amtrak on Sunday afternoons, I always see a lot of UCSD students waiting to be picked up at Solana Beach. If extended to Sorrento Valley, students could transfer from Amtrak to COASTER to trolley. There is existing bus service from Sorrento Valley to UCSD but consider light rail.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Concerned about the lack of coordination between the operation of the trolley and buses. They must work as one in the same, with scheduling and timing routes working in unison, not independently.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The trolley has failed to meet ridership goals that were established many, many years ago in the 70s. The trolley is one of the most expensive systems in the U.S., due to the policy adopted by MTDB in 1974.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Ridership in UTC, where people own cars, as opposed to more blue collar, low-income neighborhoods, like El Cajon, National City, and Chula Vista, is unlikely to be high. Not going to get people in UTC out of their cars. Will help those that commute to downtown, but how many? UTC is an employment center, but, considering vacancy rate, not employing now. UCSD students don't go downtown - they go as far as UTC.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>For total success, and to meet previously established, unmet ridership goals, you need to get people so that they don't have to own a car. Put together a system that serves them 24/7. This system will not do that - doesn't tell you how frequently they are going to run.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The Clairemont Station. Plans for a transit center so that you can actually link transit and get into the residential neighborhoods of Clairemont? What is the plan? Why bother to have a station at Clairemont? What are you going to do, have people get on?</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The stations (like Amtrak stations) are not going to be designed to work consistently with non-fixed rail transit and the street level. If it's not going to be designed to work with the buses, why bother? What happens when passengers exit the trolley?</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Clairemont Drive Station is a great opportunity for ridership. Up Clairemont Drive is one of the oldest and largest senior centers in town. Also, 300 units in area will be replaced with 600 units. To get people to the station, bus interconnections and station parking is needed.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>If no parking and no bus interconnections at stations, why bother?</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>The MTS Board needs to change its policy and make the car needless. The time has come. We are there now, with the environment. We need to make changes now. This is a necessity. MTS needs to review its errors. How many people has it moved? Two percent? Nothing!</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>I rode the bus from Clairemont Drive to downtown and the bus took 1 hour and 10 minutes, for 6 miles!</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Bob Kaul</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>The maps and figures are only an approximation. This whole meeting is ridiculous. You expect me to come up here and deal with hypothetical numbers and a hypothetical map? You don’t know directions on a map. And I’m supposed to make a decision based upon all your hypothetical bullshit? I can’t make a logical decision based on hypothetical misled pencil-pushing guys lying to me. So why did you have a meeting?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Karilyn Ballard</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Yea! So excited to hear that the trolley line is being extended to UCSD/UTC area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Mark Boydszon</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Support the Mid-Coast extension of the trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Mark Boydszon</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Favor LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Christine A.</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Support the Mid-Coast Trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Christine A.</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Would like to see more light rail throughout San Diego.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Ron Mann</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - Think this is a very good idea.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Ron Mann</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Like LRT Alt 1. It covers most of the areas in the La Jolla Dr. area where I go visit or have appointments.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Ron Mann</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - You have my vote.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Ross A. Clark</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>I really appreciate the scoping presentation to learn more about a couple of the routes.</td>
<td>Public involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Ross A. Clark</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I prefer LRT Alt 1 (1, 4, &amp; 5), as it has greater access to many places in the U.C. area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Ross A. Clark</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>LRT Alt 3 is more limited but requires other forms of public transibuses.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Michael Caton</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>San Diego needs more public transportation.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Michael Caton</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I <em>strongly support</em> building the LRT 1 route that runs along I-5, as has already been endorsed.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Michael Caton</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am strongly AGAINST LRT Alt 3 that would run through Rose Canyon to Genesee. Rose Canyon provides me with a way to decompress, not to mention the peace and quiet. To lose Rose Canyon would not only be an environmental tragedy, it would lower property values and degrade our quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Michael Caton</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - The LRT 1 route is the right choice.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Margaret Clark</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Please vote in favor of LRT Alt 1 for the trolley. This route touches more useful destinations than the other routes and looks like a real asset for the community.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Margaret Clark</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please vote against LRT Alt 3, which would destroy a large part of the irreplaceable wild places in our city.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Eve Demey</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Enough of all those projects to destroy Rose Canyon &quot;our sanctuary&quot;!!!!!!! A bridge, high speed train, and then what next?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Eve Demey</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I oppose.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Eve Demey</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Please do not turn UTC into more ugly concrete and noisy place.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Hal Pashler</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the creation of a trolley route through Rose Canyon. I do not live on the canyon, but I hike or jog through it several times a week. I am &quot;appalled&quot; at the idea of this rare natural space being destroyed to make room for a trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Hal Pashler</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please do not support this plan.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Jan Hawkins</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - When considering the trolley extension to UCSD, please support LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Jan Hawkins</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - When considering the trolley extension to UCSD, please DROP LRT Alt 3.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Jan Hawkins</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - LRT Alt 1 is not only the most useful route, accessing the most people, but we must preserve Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Phel Steinmetz</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please do not run the trolley through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Phel Steinmetz</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Think the I-5 to UCSD (LRT Alt 1) route a much better choice. It is certainly less damaging to our community's remaining natural environment.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Phel Steinmetz</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We use the canyon several times a week for exercise and a bit of peace at the end of the day. PLEASE don't run anymore transportation corridors through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Doris Dickinson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I oppose the route through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Doris Dickinson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Through Rose Canyon, I oppose the building of a bridge that is not needed.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic, Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>L. Bausch, A. Brandon, A. Budreika, P. Burch, N. Fowler, W. Griswold, L. Hofheimer, A. Ito, B. Knowlton, S. Lachmayr, M. Morris, L. Parker, C. Parnell, V. Ramey, D. Schlafman, J. Schulman, V. Zhukov</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>L. Bausch, A. Brandon, A. Budreika, P. Burch, N. Fowler, W. Griswold, L. Hofheimer, A. Ito, B. Knowlton, S. Lachmayr, M. Morris, L. Parker, C. Parnell, V. Ramey, D. Schlafman, J. Schulman, V. Zhukov</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>L. Bausch, A. Brandon, A. Budreika, P. Burch, N. Fowler, W. Griswold, L. Hofheimer, A. Ito, B. Knowlton, S. Lachmayr, M. Morris, D. Schlaflman, J. Schulman, V. Zhukov</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Cynthia Parnell</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Rose Canyon is a wonderland of SD native plants and animals. Please protect it. There is no need to destroy an open space that so many people currently use in SD. Also, do we or do we not treasure our wildlife?</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Judy Schulman</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Don’t spoil our beautiful and historic canyon! Once ruined, it can never be truly restored. Given all the building that is occurring, we need to preserve what is left of our precious open spaces, not abuse them.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Nancy Fowler</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I’ve been a resident of south University City for 18 years. I moved here because of the family neighborhood and peaceful environment. I hope your upcoming decisions will not negatively effect this community.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Valerie Ramey</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT - As an economics professor at UCSD, very excited about the prospect of a trolley route to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Valerie Ramey</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. We have so little OS left in SD. Basic economic theory says that when the supply of a good goes down, the price or value of the good should rise. For this reason, the value of OS in SD is at an all-time high.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Lance Parker</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I live ten feet from the canyon and my 3- and 5- year old boys love exploring it, chasing each other, finding bugs and rabbits, and figuring out how to cross the creek at different water levels.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Lance Parker</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT - We would love to have a mass transit option for going downtown that is more convenient, but probably wouldn't use it very much as there isn't much reason to go downtown for our family. If you're really certain that the project would benefit the region by reducing VMT, reducing pollution, or increasing transit speed, then I urge you to evaluate the I-5 route to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Tanya HoweAeria</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Need public transportation in University City. Would love to take more public transportation, but it doesn't exist here. I live at the far EAST END (by I-805) and have to walk over 1.5 miles to get to the nearest bus. Senior center in my community that has NO bus access either. Have 2 small children who will someday rely on our public transit system. I welcome all the building of rapid transit, public transit, and high speed rail systems! Please build us a decent public transit system!</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Jane E. Richardson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am strongly opposed to running the trolley through Rose Canyon when there are less environmentally sensitive alternatives. Rose Canyon is a treasure - let's preserve it for our future generations. Given the ever growing population density of SD, having a natural OS such as Rose Canyon within our midst is a blessing to us all. Please consider other options and safeguard Rose Canyon!</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>George Papen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am a strong proponent of getting mass transit to the UTC area.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>George Papen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I have looked at the proposed routes for the trolley and see no advantage of routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. In fact, if the major users will be near UCSD, the route through the canyon &quot;LRT Alt 3&quot; puts these stops at the end of the line.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>George Papen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - It seems clear that the route along I-5 &quot;LRT Alt 1&quot; is the most direct route to the major stops within UTC (UCSD and the large hospitals). Having the route terminate at the UTC transit center instead of UCSD West appears to offer additional advantages.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>George Papen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Given these considerations, I urge you to choose LRT-1 for the trolley route.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Jack Carpenter</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Ridership projections very conclusive that light rail is the appropriate vehicle to serve UTC and UCSD. Assume projections weren’t based on significant ridership from three stops in Clairemont. Unless assurance of a shuttle to serve the community, Clairemont’s transportation tax dollars being spent on the extension are not appropriately serving the community.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Financial, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Jack Carpenter</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Low density community, few residents will be close enough to walk to stops. Inadequate parking at all three stops (currently and as designed). Redevelopment opportunities at Balboa Ave and Tecolote Rd, including park and ride at Balboa Ave. At Clairemont Dr, proposal to parallel park on west side or Morena Blvd inadequate - rush hour 5 minute queue from Clairemont Dr to northbound I-5 would exceed parking potential. Parking at Mission Bay lots problematic due to narrow sidewalks on &quot;connecting&quot; bridge. Overflow parking in new Bay View Plaza problematic too.</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Jack Carpenter</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Low density suburban neighborhood. 15 to 20 minute ride to jobs in UTC, UCSD, and downtown. Difficult to get people to drive to station and use transit, when commute would be extended rather than shortened, unless shuttle service is provided &quot;as part of project&quot;. Provide a way for people to get to public transportation without using their cars.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Jack Carpenter</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Clairemont Community Planning Group developed a Vision Plan (note: attached) to augment outdated community plan. We envisioned a Super Loop bus route on Clairemont, Clairemont Mesa, Convoy, Genesee, and Balboa, with growth encouraged along route to support residents. Loop would feed into trolley system. This would preserve desired low density character of neighborhoods and better support a viable transit system.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Jack Carpenter</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Needs to be a coordinated effort to integrate bus and trolley services, as well as redevelopment, at both the Tecolote and Balboa stops, without which few Clairemont residents would benefit from this very expensive development.</td>
<td>Costs, Stations, Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Kelly Seiler</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>All schools in the area should be connected to existing transit lines. Adding UCSD to list of connected schools a step in right direction. When I went to school, used bus and bike to commute, which saved me money on parking and was good exercise.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Kelly Seiler</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Grew up in Rancho Penasquitos. Know many people who went to UCSD. For students trying to get to parent's homes, frustrating because no east west connection.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Kelly Seiler</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>On I-15 and SR 163, wish COASTER went up route instead of carpool and bus lane.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Kelly Seiler</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Rancho Penasquitos, near Black Mtn Rd and Carmel Mtn Rd, is a dead spot as far as transit is concerned. Closest bus is over a mile away and has a giant hill in between.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Dan Allen</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Project scope should include greater definition and discussion of connecting service to and from stations in the total Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Study area, such as La Jolla, Sorrento Mesa, Miramar, and Torrey Pines Mesa. Designation of just NCTD 101 for the last listed service area will not provide needed commuter connection. Adding connector service to project scope is important to physical design of stations and modifications to streets around stations for access.</td>
<td>Stations, Purpose and need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Dan Allen</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Routing should go beyond UTC to connect with the COASTER, as the Nobel COASTER stop will eventually happen.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Dan Allen</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>One of the stops at the northern end of the route needs to have a large parking lot or structure reasonably accessible to/from I-5. In future, people from Del Mar, Encinitas, etc. will expect to drive south and then use LRT, as one does today driving to Old Town and transferring modes.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Charles Heisman</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Support LRT - I like this idea immensely, but 6 years is way too long to wait. On other hand, we waited a long time for the completion of the current LRT and well worth wait. I use all of the current LRT system a lot. I go all over San Diego on all the lines for shopping and other needs. I enjoy and appreciate being able to go wherever I want, whenever I want. Thank you for finally starting something from Old Town north to UTC.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Charles Heisman</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>I think something like the LRT along the I-15 corridor from Downtown SD to Escondido would be just as beneficial and economical.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Lawrence Family JCC, Jacobs Family Campus, has been an essential community resource and program provider since 1945, with day care, day camp, after school, senior adult, Jewish Cultural, and sports and fitness programs that benefit all ages. In 1982, established its presence on 13 acres in UTC, building the current 97,000 sq ft facility. Averages 140,000 monthly visitations (35,000 unduplicated people). Proud to be open and welcoming the entire community and appreciative of great support and involvement received over the years.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - As an active facility with tremendous foot traffic, trolley extension is of utmost importance to us. Believe bringing trolley to Golden Triangle is a critical and necessary move for the city to take.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Understand three alternate routes being planned, would like to go on record supporting route LRT 1 which goes through UCSD along Genesee Ave and ending at UTC mall. Confident this route will provide the greatest amount of flexibility to community, with least amount of public disruption.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT 3, no LRT 6 - Very much opposed to the other two alignments: LRT 3 and LRT 6; both would be disruptive to JCC operations, put individuals (especially children and seniors) at risk due to traffic patterns and create an unfavorable hardship on 35,000 people who regularly utilize facility. Since both travel along Executive Dr, our main entrance, the noise would be very disruptive to our 500 seat theatre, which is used an average of 48 weeks/year.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - JCC is thriving and benefitting thousands (all ages) who rely on us for their physical, mental, and emotional well-being. We look forward to a very long and productive future in Golden Triangle serving our neighborhood and overall city. Goal is to continue meeting needs of community and being a good partner and resource. Believe strongly LRT 1 would help us achieve this mission.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Julie Potiker</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - While we feel the trolley will benefit the JCC, we believe it is even more essential for the overall community.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Lawrence Family JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Over past 5 years, Friends of Rose Creek has organized cleanups, embarked on projects with SD Enviro Services, performed habitat restoration, and advocated for creek. Have involved students and scouts in projects. Vision is for lower Rose Creek to be an open space park providing recreational and learning opportunities and a clean, healthy, aesthetically pleasing enviro for residents, visitors, businesses, and native plants and animals, while serving as an accessible link for bicyclist and pedestrians to move between Rose Canyon, Marian Bear, and Mission Bay Parks, and surrounding communities.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek is a member organization of Rose Creek Watershed (RCW) Alliance, an alliance of community orgs dedicated to improving RCW. Alliance has prepared a guidance document that serves as a tool for decision-makers, such as SANDAG, to minimize impacts of projects proposed for watershed. In Oct 2008, SD City Council accepted RCW Assessment (Assessment) as guidance doc for activities in watershed. Assessment contains a series of recommendations (Section 2) that if implemented/considered by project proponents would enhance watershed. Ask SANDAG to review in Draft SEIS/SEIR each recommendation found in Section 2 and specifically address the potential of Mid-Coast Project to implement and/or undermine or controvert each recommendation (note: Assessment website provided: <a href="http://www.rosecreekwatershed.org">www.rosecreekwatershed.org</a>).</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Oppose LRT 3 through Rose Canyon and any other route that travels outside of the existing railroad right-of-way, through Rose Canyon Open Space Park past the I-5/Gilman Dr exit ramp, and through any of the parklands of Marian Bear Memorial Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Request the Draft SEIS/SEIR to provide details for any contour changes to Rose Creek, including but not limited to plans which would move the alignment of the creek, channelize any portion of the creek, underground any section of the creek or its tributaries and impede existing creek flow in any manner.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>When considering the potential impacts of the trolley, request the Draft SEIS/SEIR also address the cumulative impacts for other projects proposed in the area. Include, but not limited to, California High Speed Rail, Amtrak/COASTER improvements, and proposed bridges in the area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>As a California impaired water body, request Draft SEIS/SEIR identify opportunities for improving water quality in areas along the rail right-of-way.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>All mitigation opportunities for work performed adjacent to Rose Creek south of SR 52 and north of Santa Fe St needs to be performed in this stretch of the creek, including the impacts of construction and ongoing maintenance of the trolley. We request the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address this issue.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Urge SANDAG to find an alignment that results in a zero loss to existing parks.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Draft SEIS/SEIR should also address funding for, implementation of, and maintenance of items in Assessment. These include, but are not limited to, the following: safe and legal railroad track crossing to allow residents of University City, Clairemont, and Pacific Beach to move freely within these communities on foot and bicycle; restoration of currently degraded habitat and removal of concrete impediments, where feasible, to allow a more natural wetland habitat to thrive; and, new trails to support visitor enjoyment of area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Rose Canyon Bike Path is one of the most heavily used bike paths in the county and serves as a major non-motorized transportation corridor. Want to ensure no degradation of this bike path as a result of ANY transportation projects in area. Specifically request Draft SEIS/SEIR to address aesthetic, visual, and noise related impacts to the user experience on this bike path.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>No LRT - Oppose trolley coming to UCSD area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Concerned with existing activities. Traffic is already bad in my neighborhood due to the SuperLoop. College students are parking their cars on the street and taking the free SuperLoop to UCSD. The noise level in my neighborhood is my biggest complaint.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>If the trolley comes, it is going to double the traffic. People will drive, for example, from northern areas, like Carlsbad, and park in our neighborhoods, which is not a parking facility. Dislike that they have turned my neighborhood into a park and ride.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The SuperLoop, Routes 201 and 202, is noisy. It runs up and down my street 180 times per day. The SuperLoop was put in the neighborhood for residents to take shopping, to mail, and to work, but not how it is being used. SuperLoop is being used to shuttle college students who park in my neighborhood. They park at Ralph’s, up and down Villa La Jolla, and all over the street. No parking when college in session. They take free bus transportation to college.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Feel that having the trolley come through this neighborhood is going to increase the traffic, more traffic. It is miserable to get around my neighborhood. That was one of my biggest complaints.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Worried about crime. You hear about a lot of crime being associated with the trolley. That is what I’m concerned about.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>I'm opposed to the noise. Don’t appreciate the results of the SuperLoop. I think it's all connected and that once the trolley comes, they're going to add more of these noisy buses up and down the street. It's affected my quality of life. I've come to point where I almost have to try to sell my place to avoid this. The noise is unbelievable.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Richard VanFleet</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Oppose trolley project because I think it will add more traffic, more congestion to neighborhood. People come from all over to park their cars here. They may take their car downtown, take the shuttle or whatever that's called, the trolley to Old Town or to the ballpark. I'm just concerned about the traffic in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Dale Disharoon</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Concerned about noise, not only as the trolley comes to grade over to I-5, back of La Jolla Village Square, but also along La Jolla Colony, where sound walls will be required to keep the sound radiating into the freeway, not onto residences. Understand noise is a community-wide concern. Whoever doing acoustic testing needs to be especially sensitive to this area, as there are a lot of condos. We have 18 condo associations in area west of I-5. Also, the La Jolla Colony area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Dale Disharoon</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Concerned about parking. With SuperLoop in area, now have the greater SD area parking in our area, jumping on local transit to go to UCSD (90 percent of SuperLoop ridership is UCSD passengers, coming into our area, mostly parking then going onto UCSD and returning to cars at night).</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Dale Disharoon</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>At Nobel Drive Station, need a large parking structure, probably around 1,000 to 2,000 parking spaces, for people who park in parking lots around us (not going to UCSD) and for future events. As the northern end of this transit system, people will be parking in our community to head south for events, like football and baseball games.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Dale Disharoon</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Have a stop that is closer, if not right at, the VA Medical Center. As proposed, a two-block walk for Veterans and shuttles aren’t the way to do it. At this planning stage, ideal time to ensure direct connection to the VA Medical Center for Vets. Vets will provide a lot of ridership. Vet won’t have direct transit access to 3 areas: Regional, Southern Regional Desert, and Southern Regional VA Medical Center.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Fiona Kitson</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Main concern is noise and on the area that they do everything to prevent the noise, disturbing all the residents.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Fiona Kitson</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Concerned with parking, as we are already experiencing a lot of parking</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Fiona Kitson</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Want a stop at the VA Medical Center.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Don't like LRT Alt 3 because it goes to UTC before UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Would take longer for people to get to UCSD. Believe most people would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be going to UCSD than UTC. Use an alt that goes directly from south to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCSD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Ensure no UC funds are used for this project.</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>When construction happens, use union employees, as we need to have</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>living wages in San Diego.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - Really like the fact that they are connecting Old Town</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>with UCSD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>UCSD West Station goes through a really important canyon on campus. Has</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>SANDAG or UCSD taken into consideration? Has UCSD outreached to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and assessed impacts of going through farm? Advise looking at impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will there be subsidies to relocate the farm? Coordination with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>farm, keeping both the farm and the station? Hopefully SANDAG or UCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will take into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support need - Project is absolutely critical, as I can't drive</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>anymore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>VA Station - All alternatives go past the VA, no station at the VA. I</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>see a lot of people getting on and off of buses at the VA, most of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>using a wheelchair, walker, or other walking aid. No reason not to have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a stop at the VA for these folks. Absolutely critical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Need public transportation up to Carmel Valley, as there is nothing there, zero. No buses, trains, nothing. It is a fully and inhabited operational development, it's big. We bought here because I can't drive and we wanted to live in Carmel Valley, but I'd feel trapped. Only 5 miles, but no transit.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Would like to see more thorough documentation of why certain alternatives were picked over others, especially LRT vs. BRT. Chart of user benefits over &quot;simplifies&quot; the comparison between LRT and BRT, which is good for simple informative session, but for a public view or public information session, information on how they modeled the numbers would be beneficial, as the numbers are crucial to the decision of selecting LRT over BRT.</td>
<td>Requests for information, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Nice if there was a station somewhere near Rose Canyon, like bottom of Gilman. Gilman and I-5 would be convenient. Need more stops between Balboa Ave and La Jolla Village Square, because it is a long way to go without any stops.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - It sounds pretty good.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>It wouldn't be as convenient for me as if there were a stop somewhere in the middle there. If you do put a stop somewhere around SR 52 and I-5 or Gilman and I-5, that would be nice.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>I really rely on public transit. We really, really need an expansion of public transit in San Diego, in general, but especially to connect to UCSD. A lot of students don't have the means to have their own car, as many live on minimum wage or have families. Having lived in Europe and Chicago, I appreciate the value and service of reliable, safe, and affordable public transit.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support need - Transit links communities and makes them more accessible. Imagine how the City of SD and UCSD could benefit from the transit link. The Scripps Clinic, the aquarium, and campus art gallery and theatre are inaccessible to most people who live in city that can't come up, which is a real problem. A public university, or anything funded by tax dollars, needs to be accessible to as many people as possible. Strong supporter of linking the city with UCSD via public transit.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Linking the city with UCSD is important on weekends too. I can’t come to UCSD on weekends, as it takes me almost 2 hours to get here on the bus. Quite a burden. Would be more difficult if it weren’t for the UCSD shuttles connecting Hillcrest to UCSD. Take the city buses, but they have very limited service. Unfortunate.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Making everything more accessible is good for everyone, tourists too, right? Very touristy city. Tourists may come here and rent cars, but not necessarily. Some may need transit.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Frederick Raab</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - I’m in favor of it. I’m a great supporter of rail transit, due to positive impacts. I lived in Washington DC when they put the metro in. There, people didn’t realize the positive changes that were going to happen; they just focused on the near term and missed the economic growth that metro was going to bring to the city. Similar situation in Boston, with the expansion of the Red and Orange Lines, which contributed to ridership growth, economic growth, and development.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Frederick Raab</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>People should be aware of the long term economic benefits of LRT. It may be 5, 10, or 20 years out, but it is worth the investment now.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Financial, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Frederick Raab</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT - They should have done it long ago when the trolley was first built. I don’t see why they didn’t follow the right-of-way.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Frederick Raab</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>They should have double-tracked the commuter rail a long time ago, all the way up to Oceanside.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Florentino Guizar</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 6 - LRT Alt 6, the one that makes &quot;s&quot; shapes near UCSD West, is a bad move. Not cost effective.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Comment is vital and very important, to everyone that takes public transit. To MTS department, many routes connect to Fashion Valley, University City, and San Ysidro. Why no train, bus, or trolley connection to Oceanside?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>When constructed bus or trolley system, why didn’t you think about human beings needing a restroom? We need to eat, drink, and discharge. There are no clean restrooms for people to use. Can use nearby store, if open, but not practical. I ride transit for fun, including the trolley and SPRINTER, no restroom stops. If passengers travel, where are they going to go? Amtrak, with long distance travel, has restrooms; not the trolley. County-wide system has no restrooms, zero. We are human beings. 15 minute restroom breaks at office and school. At Old Town and Fashion Valley transit centers, portable restrooms for bus drivers only, why not passengers? All human bodies. Need a restroom at every two stops (not every stop). Indicate restrooms on bus and trolley schedules/maps. On a trolley ride to East County, a man, who needed a restroom, exited the trolley and discharged on the station property - in front of everyone.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>The Trolley Green Line Fashion Valley Station, a heavily used station, needs 2 elevators. Construction was a good idea, but it needs 2 elevators. The one elevator is old and, because there is no restroom, people use it as a restroom. It smells. Guess someone complained because they wash it at least once a day; still, people continue to urinate in or near the elevator. Sometimes, nowhere to walk or elevator is out of service. It is 53 steps. A mother with baby and stroller cannot walk up/down steps. Original construction I saw 2 elevators, only built 1. If have a small store at street level, where snacks are sold, had space to build another elevator. They need 2 elevators to serve the public, especially older people and mothers with kids.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Money to build the extension, from Old Town to UCSD, would be better spent upgrading the older route by putting a restroom at every two stops. That would serve the public needs. I use transit, no restrooms. Passengers are underserved. Older route needs to be corrected or improved. A good system to serve the public is more than just a new trolley or bus, it needs to serve basic human needs, like restrooms and elevators. Need an elevator at Fashion Valley.</td>
<td>Financial, Purpose and need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - University City Planning Group (UCPG) has voted unanimously (19-0) to strongly support LRT 1 (combining LRT 1, 4, and 5) as the preferred alt for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - University City Planning Group (UCPG) has voted unanimously (19-0) to delete LRT 3 from further scoping review.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 6 - University City Planning Group (UCPG) has voted unanimously (19-0) to delete LRT 6 from further scoping review.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - As far back as 1987, SANDAG identified a “preferred alternative” route much like the present day LRT 1. The 1987 University Community Plan identifies an LRT 1-like corridor that connects to UCSD and major activity centers in University City. Plan also favors an Executive Drive Station to accommodate high density business in area. This “preferred alternative” has been studied and refined over the years, and conclusions remained unchanged. LRT 1 best meets the multidimensional gauges (e.g. consistency with user benefits, regional and local plans, land use/economic development, and environmental considerations/sustainability) most recently articulated in the Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Evaluation criteria, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - LRT 1 is more cost effective than LRT 3 according to SANDAG analysis of alternative LRT routes.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - LRT 1 proposal has widespread community support including residents from different University City neighborhoods, the Associated Students of UCSD (ASUCSD), Scripps and UCSD Hospitals, and Sciences International Applications (SAIC). Significant support stems from placement of Nobel Drive and Executive Drive Stations, which are absent in LRT 3. Nobel Drive Station supported by many, including ASUCSD and reps of the LDS Temple, as it serves adjacent businesses and residents, providing access to Downtown San Diego. Executive Drive Station is supported by diverse groups, including Amylin Pharmaceutical Corporation, the La Jolla Day School, and the Lawrence Family JCC, which reflects the diversity of activity in this dense area, and would be conveniently located for shuttle buses to/from businesses in the Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, and Torrey Pine Mesa areas.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Although LRT 1 is most favored by UCPG and in the University Community Plan, number of questions and concerns raised by both the public and UCPG Executive Committee that we are requesting to be addressed in Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>In conjunction with traffic concerns, increased pedestrian access is also desirable. For example, with aerial align crossing I-5, Draft SEIS/SEIR should study feasibility of a ped bridge to link the La Jolla Colony area and LDS Temple with Nobel Drive Station. Bicycle access along ped bridge should also be studied.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Rose Creek bicycle path that runs along the existing right-of-way, from La Jolla Colony Dr south to Santa Fe St and Pacific Beach, must be preserved. This is a heavily-used corridor for recreational and commuting cyclists.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Bike-friendly policies at the stations, including bike racks and secure storage lockers, are recommended to reduce car traffic to and facilitate use of stations by local residents.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>As the University Community is virtually built out, the UCPG does not favor additional transit-oriented development (TOD) around transit stations.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The UCPG favors convenient shuttle access to and from high-density employment centers, including large businesses, public facilities, and hospitals, as well as surrounding geographical areas that attract businesses, such as Sorrento Mesa, Sorrento Valley, and Torrey Pines Mesa. The Draft SEIS/SEIR should develop specific ways to provide connections to these and other employment centers.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Neither of the two adjacent stations provide direct access to the VA Medical Center. Significant support at the UCPG meeting to resolve this issue. Since VA Medical Center is a federal facility, on federally-owned property, and considering the federal government will likely contribute significant funding for the project, more direct access for our veterans, disabled or otherwise, should be studied and provided in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Stations, Financial, Purpose and need</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Current draft plan indicates parking at both the Nobel Drive and UTC Transit Center Stations. Likely that the local community will want to access trolley for trips downtown, which will lead to increased traffic and parking demand at both stations. Currently, limited parking at both sites and insufficient off-street parking in surrounding areas. For Nobel Drive Station, new structure is essential. At Westfield UTC, no increased parking for a transit facility allowed in the University Community Plan amendment and reliance on walking or a bus connection may be unrealistic. Draft SEIS/SEIR needs to study the need for parking at these and all other station locations.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should study the effect of all proposed stations on traffic. For the UTC Transit Center Station, consider the option of acquiring entitled trips from developers to offset any traffic increases. The recently approved University Community Plan amendment for the Westfield UTC expansion identified 1.5 million square feet of new retail, 250 new residential units, and an increase in traffic by 18,000 trips.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Impacts on traffic and parking, both during construction and operation, should be studied and mitigated, where possible.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>While the 1987 University Community Plan is consistent with the development of an LRT system, identifying the I-5 corridor recommended by SANDAG in 1986, and stations at Nobel Drive and Executive Drive, it also recommends park-and-ride facilities (note: PDF states &quot;see issues to study under Parking above&quot;).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The 1987 University Community Plan states that Rose Canyon Open Space Park is considered a regional resource with regional significance and attraction (p. 225). Also, it states that Rose Canyon should be preserved as dedicated open space and used for passive recreational uses rather than active uses requiring major grading and construction (p. 233). Further, it states that future uses of Rose Canyon should consider the topography, vegetation, and scenic value of the park to the community, and serve to separate and define the neighborhoods to the north and south (p. 233, p. 226).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3 would have a major impact on Rose Canyon Open Space Park (note: parkland), a regional resource, as defined in the University Community Plan. As a result, it is inconsistent with the University Community Plan (note: land use).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3 is incompatible with city’s stated purpose (note: land use) for open space parks: “Open Space within the City of San Diego is defined as areas generally free from development or developed with low intensity uses that respect natural environmental resources, passive outdoor recreation, and scenic and visual enjoyment” (City of San Diego, Department of Park and Recreation).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report indicates a total of 18 partial private property acquisitions, both residential and commercial properties, totaling 5.5 acres for LRT Alt 1. We request the Final Comparative Eval of Alts Report, due in July, include the location of these acquisitions.</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Request that the Final Comparative Eval of Alts Report, due in July, include the locations of acquisitions (note: acquisitions) within Rose Canyon Open Space Park (note: parkland). Draft now states, for LRT 1, acquisition of .77 acres, with 4,023 linear feet of alignment adjacent to parkland, and, for LRT 3, acquisition of .65 acres, with 14,235 linear feet of alignment adjacent to parkland. Although acreage for LRT 3 does not significantly increase over LRT 1, the linear feet adjacent to parkland for LRT 3 does increase significantly and should be avoided.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Requests for information, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report indicates that air quality is not considered a significant factor in the selection of alternatives for scoping. What will be the studies necessary to meet the Federal Clean Air Act and any other local or state requirements for air quality during construction and operation and when will those studies be conducted and mitigations proposed?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What field investigations and site inspections will be performed for the study of fault crossings for significant structures proposed, in particular, the Rose Canyon Fault and minor faults in the area?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What is the potential for earthquakes and the extent and type of such resulting earthquake damage: in a tunnel, above grade, other?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What other geologic hazard categories will be studied and how mitigated, such as landslides, slope stability (in particular, in the narrow right-of-way along La Jolla Colony and other similar topography), liquefaction, compressible soils, expansive soils, corrosive soils, faults rupture hazard, and ground shaking?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Will a storage or maintenance station be located in the University City area? If so, what size and what will be the visual, hazardous material, noise, etc. impacts?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>How will the project communicate to the University City community their construction schedules and duration?</td>
<td>Public involvement, Schedule</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report says that, compared to at-grade alignments, alignments on aerial structures would have a greater potential visual impact on surrounding areas, due to increased visibility of the structures. What about construction impacts to build the aerial structures, what construction mitigations will be studied?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What other visual effects of transit vehicles, guideways, fences, or stations can be mitigated for both commercial properties and residential views? (See Attachment A, which includes, but is not limited to, residential areas that should be studied).</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Any consideration of LRT 3 should study the major negative aesthetic and visual impacts on the great majority of Rose Canyon Open Space Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Although a tunnel for LRT 3 would have lower visual impacts, public comments at the UCPG meeting were against LRT 3, due to tunneling under Genesee Ave and issues associated with tunneling, such as costs, traffic impacts due to construction, venting for air circulation, and safety precautions. The UCPG supports the deletion of LRT 3.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should study all direct and indirect impacts on Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marian Bear Memorial Park, the Mandell-Weiss Eastgate City Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bike path).</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The FTA Manual “Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment” on p. 5-70 defines Land Use Category 1 as land where quiet is an essential element in its intended purpose. Because Rose Canyon is an open space park used for passive recreation, as stated by the City of San Diego’s Park and Recreation Department, the park falls into Category 1. As result, LRT 3 would run counter to FTA noise standards.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts of the LRT 3 alignment on the Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation areas in Rose Canyon Open Space Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - According to Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report (p. S-19), LRT 3 would have the greatest potential for impacts to sensitive habitats and wetlands. This is another reason why LRT 3 should be removed from further consideration.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What have studies shown relative to crime statistics when a trolley station is built within a community: violent and gang related crime, rape, narcotics, transient issues in park areas, and crimes related to property (residential, commercial, and auto)? Does crime increase? If so, what mitigations can be established?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Requests for information, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Within the City of San Diego Police Department (SDPD) Northern Neighborhood, only one SDPD station is identified. Considering the large coverage area of the Northern Neighborhood, north to Torrey Pines, east to Miramar, and south to Mission Beach, what additional mitigations may be required to augment both SDPD and MTS security at the North University stations?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>To what extent will noise and vibration criteria measurements be conducted to meet City, State, and FTA standards especially relative to noise frequency for all commercial, school, hospitals, park and residential areas? (See Attachment A, which includes, but is not limited to, residential areas that should be studied).</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Will noise studies include following: tests for current ambient noise and projected peak estimated noise, relative to the distance for the proposed alignments, both during construction and operation (study should include projected 2030 operations, with 7.5 minute frequencies); noise mitigation for both outside levels, such as condo common areas, streets, and parks, and interior noise levels; tests when windows are both opened and closed; noise mitigation efforts including the study of sound walls, dual pane windows, insulation, mechanical ventilation or air conditioning with windows closed (with required number of air changes per hour), or other; and, analysis of noise barrier absorption and geometry during the review of noise mitigation?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>At what distances will noise measurements be conducted to mitigate for elevated operation, which, according to the Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report, can generate higher levels of sound at greater distances?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What are noise issues that will be studied for stations, storage yards, or maintenance facilities?</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>How will wheel squeal, wheel impacts, wheel rolling, and other equipment related to noise be studied? Won’t wheel squeal, for example, be a greater noise impact for LRT 3 requiring tighter curves turning north by Genesee Highlands? How will impacts be assessed as noise increases due to track wear over time?</td>
<td>Alternatives, Requests for information, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>What are the cumulative effects on noise considering other transportation projects, such as the California High Speed Rail, SuperLoop, Regents Road bridge, or increased traffic on I-5?</td>
<td>Requests for information, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - LRT 3 is not compatible with the following SANDAG regional policy goal of sustainability (as adopted in 2007 in the RTP), which is listed as a project objective: “limit impacts to sensitive habitats” (p. S-6).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Evaluation criteria, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR needs to study all cumulative impacts for this project.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Yes LRT 1, No LRT 3 - Various constituents of the University City community (resident, business, educational, healthcare, and religious groups) have expressed broad-based support for LRT 1 and opposition to LRT 3. Along with support for LRT 1, constituents have also raised concerns about details of the proposal.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - UCPG reiterates our opposition to LRT 3 and requests that it be discontinued from consideration.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Janay Kruger</td>
<td>5/11/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Request that issues (note: environmental and transportation) raised in relation to LRT 1 be studied in detail and that design modifications and mitigation measure be built into the project to reduce or eliminate impacts, when possible. Realize these changes may come at some financial cost, but urge SANDAG and FTA to recognize that community support for the project, as it moves forward, will be well worth the price.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Public involvement, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Bringing additional alternative transportation options to our growing campus and the San Diego region is critical to a healthier environment and the region’s economic vitality. This new access, to/from campus, will change the transportation paradigm for our students, staff, and faculty as soon as operations begin, and ridership will surely increase over time.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - Extending LRT to UCSD West and East Campuses, as soon as possible, is imperative to allow our campus to minimize its impacts on San Diego’s freeways, local roads, and intersections.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Would like to acknowledge excellent working relationship UCSD has enjoyed with SANDAG, Caltrans, MTS, and NCTD. These partnerships are critical to achieve the common goal of using alternative transportation rather than relying on SOVs. The Chancellor has, and will continue, to strongly support this goal at UCSD.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>In July 2010, SANDAG Board may select 1 of the 3 LRT alternatives proposed during scoping. Understand and support this strategy, as it will allow SANDAG to immediately seek matching Federal funding through FTA and thereby accelerate the project schedule.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Financial, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - UCSD ready to continue working with SANDAG on the project design to ensure selected LRT alternative, if 1 alternative is selected for next phase, serves both the campus and community, and that any potential impacts are effectively mitigated.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Intend to be an engaged partner to ensure safety and security of our campus community, including the following: students in Sixth College, adjacent to the UCSD West Station (station was included in the University Center/Sixth College Neighborhood Plan adopted by UCSD in 2004); students who attend the Preuss School, our charter middle/high school on UCSD East Campus; and, the preservation of emergency and non-emergency access to the UCSD Medical Center.</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>In general, safe and effective pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation, to, from, and on the campus, are top concerns and priorities.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>UCSD has developed a detailed list of issues that must be addressed and mitigated by the project. Issues include, but are not limited to, noise, vibration, safety, security, circulation, biology, construction staging, electromagnetic fields, and aesthetic impacts.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Look forward to engaging SANDAG in an iterative design process that allows us to play an active role in the development of the project located on UCSD campus. Prior to the development of the final alignment and station design, campus needs to review and approve concept renderings. It is our expectation that this analysis will begin early in the process to allow time for the evaluation of how the project will integrate into the urban fabric of our campus. Looking for renderings/three-dimensional drawings of the project, including the type of structure and its relationship to topography, existing and future buildings, and the circulation network. This info is critical to fully evaluate the project and determine what is best for the campus setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>To continue to foster our partnership, ask that meetings with staff, which include staff from UCSD, SANDAG, and MTS, be expanded to include Caltrans and occur on a bi-weekly basis to ensure steady progress. Work of the group will continue to include development of plans and agreements related to security and safety (peds, bicycle, and vehicular), station locations and design, track elevations (aerial, at grade, and below grade), integration with Caltrans’ planned I-5 widening and proposed Voigt Dr DAR, future Gilman Dr bridge (over I-5), and use of campus land for project right-of-way and stations. Info developed by this group will continue to be reviewed by standing campus committees, such as campus/community planning committee, open space committee, and the design review board, for their review, input, and recommendations to chancellor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>As the campus has contemplated and discussed LRT, it has gathered the concerns, impacts, and general comments received from various meetings, people, and discussions, as attached (note: attachment has been reviewed/included as separate comments). Comments are based on the Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - UCSD is ready to engage at a deeper and more detailed level as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Thank you for this opportunity to work on this exciting project that will provide a new mode of transportation for UCSD and other Mid-Coast locations.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Once the SANDAG Board acts in July, UCSD will focus much more intensively on the details of the chosen alternative(s) with the proposed LRT work group and campus standing committees.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 1. Advantages: impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized. Disadvantages: several at-grade crossings, impacting vehicular circulation and visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists; separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Dr; Integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Dr DAR creates a complex issue for construction phasing and operation; impacts to Preuss School, including safety of pedestrians; impacts to campus recreation lands; impacts to Campus Point Drive intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>Alignments, Environmental impacts, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 4. Advantages: impacts to sensitive biological resources are minimized; aerial alignment on UCSD East Campus minimizes circulation impacts; potential for reduced LRT right-of-way requirements; regional access to UCSD East Station more easily accommodated at this location, with elevated station allowing flexibility of land uses; aerial alignment may better integrate with proposed Voigt Dr DAR improvements. Disadvantages: separates Warren Field and Canyonview Pool recreation complexes along Voigt Dr; impacts to campus recreation lands; integration of LRT and proposed at-grade Voigt Dr DAR, with Campus Point Dr realignment, is critical during design, construction, and operation; coordination with access to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus needed.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 5. Advantages: avoids Voigt Dr, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; reduces impacts to Preuss School; regional access to UCSD East Station more easily accommodated at this location; minimizes impact to baseball field; eliminates impact to Campus Point Dr intersection at entry to UCSD Medical Center and for emergency vehicles. Disadvantages: impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources; impacts to recreational lands; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; potential impacts to future UCSD East Campus development sites; Campus Point Dr realignment as part of proposed Voigt Dr DAR still being studied, which may impact the feasibility of this alignment.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3. Advantages: avoids Voigt Dr, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; avoids impacts to campus recreational lands; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. Disadvantages: impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; potential impacts to Mesa Housing and Science Research Park; and, constrained design opportunities for future I-5/Gilman Drive bridge project.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Gary C. Matthews</td>
<td>6/25/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 6. Advantages: avoids Voigt Dr, ensuring ability to advance LRT independent of proposed DAR; avoids impacts to Preuss School; UCSD East Station location most proximate to UCSD Medical Center; and, avoids impacts to UCSD Medical Center and UCSD East Campus access. Disadvantages: impacts to UCSD Park and sensitive biological resources south of Thornton Hospital; additional impacts to Sixth College student housing on north; UCSD East Station location not desirable for regional access; impacts to Health Sciences buildings to be constructed on UCSD East Campus (office buildings and CTRI Phase 2); and, potential impacts to planned I-5/Gilman Drive bridge.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Rose Creek Watershed (RCW) Alliance is an alliance of community orgs dedicated to improving RCW. Over past 6+ years, working with San Diego Earthworks (SDEW) as stakeholders of a plan to improve the RCW, which begins on MCAS Miramar, at the headwaters of Rose and San Clemente Creeks, and ends in Mission Bay, at De Anza Cove. The plan, known as the RCW Opportunities Assessment (Assessment), was developed by SDEW using funds provided by the Coastal Conservancy, the San Diego Foundation, and the County of San Diego. The Assessment was supported by the SD City Council in 2008 as a guidance doc for the watershed. Assessment can be found on the project website at: <a href="http://www.rosecreekwatershed.org">http://www.rosecreekwatershed.org</a>. As a guiding doc, the Assessment is a tool that can be used by decision-makers, such as SANDAG, to minimize impacts of projects proposed for watershed. Assessment contains a series of recommendations (Section 2) that if implemented/considered by project proponents would enhance watershed. In the case of this project, could help SANDAG better meet project goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria, General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>SDEW has been working to implement the recommendations of the Assessment, including the development of a watershed hydrology model, which will be available to SANDAG and others proposing watershed projects. Data sharing between SANDAG and the watershed project has already occurred and we encourage SANDAG to utilize the Assessment, and associated technical resources, so as to not duplicate efforts and to maximize the use of limited public resources.</td>
<td>Costs, General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Proposed LRT Alts 1 (combined LRT Alts 1, 4, and 5), 3, and 6 will traverse the spine of the lower watershed, an area we call Lower Rose Creek, south of SR 52 and extending north of SR 52 to La Jolla Colony Dr.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - LRT Alt 3 will also head east into Rose Canyon. According to Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report, LRT Alt 3 will have a significantly greater impact on the environment. For this reason, support removal of LRT Alt 3 from consideration.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Encourage SANDAG to evaluate LRT Alts 1 and 6, with LRT 1 as the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT Alts 1, 3, and 6 would have the potential to significantly effect the RCW and possibly foreclose the improvements recommended in the Assessment. Therefore, ask SANDAG to review in Draft SEIS/SEIR each recommendation of the Assessment found in Section 2 and specifically address the potential of Mid-Coast Project to implement and/or undermine or controvert each recommendation. While we request all recommendations be reviewed and commented on, will highlight those where the potential nexus between the projects is strongest, warranting specific consideration by SANDAG.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Assessment recommendations include enhancing the biological connection of the RCW to Mission Bay, through Lower Rose Creek, and the following (throughout the watershed): controlling invasive species; restoring and enhancing habitats; protecting and enhancing wildlife corridors through minimizing, eliminating, or either improving existing barriers or eliminating impacts to new barriers; and, establishing consistent land management. Today, habitat and land mgmt is disjointed throughout watershed, based largely on ownership. For example, in some areas, active mgmt of invasive species, such as Marian Bear Memorial Park and Rose Canyon Open Space Park, and in other areas, such as MTS/SDNR right-of-way, no mgmt occurs. Within railroad right-of-way, invasive plant seeds are spread by the movement of trains throughout the RCW. Result of this lack of resource mgmt by MTS is degradation of the quality of the watershed’s biological resources.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>With additional trains passing through the MTS/SDNR right-of-way as a result of this project, additional infection of invasive plant seeds will occur.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>According to the California Invasive Plant Council, invasive plants displace native plants and wildlife, increase wildfire and flood danger, consume valuable water, degrade recreational opportunities, and destroy productive range that would otherwise be available to support wildlife, including endangered and threatened species. The Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) calls for the control of invasive species for the same reason.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Assessment Recommendation 2.2.2 calls for the management of invasives throughout the watershed in management zones, including Zone 7, the railroad right-of-way. We recommend that the Draft SEIS/SEIR analyze the impact of the Mid-Coast Project on the spread of invasive exotic species and consider as potential mitigation of that impact that MTS begin active mgmt of invasive species in the existing railroad right-of-way through the entire watershed (as seeds are both wind-blown and move downstream) to control the spread of invasive plants associated with rail use of the watershed.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>New trains will restrict wildlife movement through the watershed and potential impacts must be reviewed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. However, more significantly, any fencing of the tracks could seriously restrict wildlife movement directly counter to the recommendations of the Assessment and MSCP.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>New trains will affect public and recreational movement in the watershed and could create serious user conflicts.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>We oppose any fencing of the tracks or rail corridor unless the specific purpose is to enhance and/or direct wildlife movement and enhance public safety. The Assessment addresses the issue of recreational crossings in Recommendation 2.5.5.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Draft SEIS/SEIR must evaluate other impacts on wildlife, including, but not limited to: habitat loss and alteration, noise, and lighting. All LRT alignments will have impacts on areas adjacent to and in the MSCP. Draft SEIS/SEIR must fully evaluate and address these impacts.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Establishing consistent land management throughout watershed is an important issue for stakeholders. A long-term goal is to connect the upper and lower watershed (Rose and Marian Bear Memorial parks with Lower Rose Creek to Mission Bay) as one regional natural open space resource. The current disjointed management described earlier, leads to a loss in resource value and degradation of taxpayer investment.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Native habitat at the west end of Marian Bear Memorial Park, which extends into and south along Lower Rose Creek, is some of the highest quality habitat in the entire watershed. Same habitat SANDAG proposes to convert to rail right-of-way in 5.2.13 of the Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report. Habitat begins in Marian Bear Memorial Park and extends into Lower Rose Creek. Northern portion (highest quality) benefits from management of Marian Bear Memorial Park; however, as creek moves south, management ceases and infections by invasive species begin, and creek becomes haven for illegal activities. Lower Roes Creek could serve as a flood control channel and a regional rec resource, if managed consistently.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>A fundamental purpose of the Assessment is to encourage mgmt of the watershed as an integrated natural, flood control, and recreational resource to maximize public benefits and taxpayer resources. As mentioned earlier, the rail corridor should be managed consistent with that integrated effort (but has not been to date).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Reducing the amt of park land in the watershed, especially parklands with quality habitat, as SANDAG has proposed, should be avoided as it runs counter to to creating an integrated natural system. We oppose the proposal to sell any public parklands to add to the rail right-of-way, as described in the Draft Comparative Eval of Alt Repor 5.2.13 on p. 5-79, as inconsistent with enhancing the watershed and detrimental to the creation of an integrated regional open space system. Also inconsistent with SANDAG regional policy objective to limit potential impacts to sensitive habitats. Encourage instead that the proposed rail alignment stay within the current rail right-of-way.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Assessment Recommendation 2.2.3 calls for expansion and enhancement of riparian and wetland habitats and restoration of upland habitats. Additionally, Recommendation 2.6 calls for development of data and models to help understand the hydrology and hydraulics of the watershed, reduce erosion, investigate the feasibility of modifying or removing concrete flood control channels, and reduce water pollution.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Assessment includes recommendations identifying specific candidate restoration sites for potential improvement and calls for further analysis of those sites, including modeling and consideration of their potential positive and negative impacts. Depending on the impacts that SANDAG must mitigate for the Mid Coast Project, these Assessment-recommended sites could be appropriate for Mid Coast Project mitigation and we would encourage they be considered as part of the Draft SEIS/SEIR so that mitigation and restoration efforts can be coordinated and implemented seamlessly.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>SDEW received grant to develop hydrology and hydraulic data, as recommended in Assessment and study is underway. Original impetus for Assessment was to investigate whether any of the current concrete flood control channel could be removed without negatively affective flood carrying capacity. Associated task was to model the potential restoration sites recommended in Assessment, to verify their feasibility and potential impact on watershed hydrology. Urge SANDAG to work closely with the RCW team to share data and use the hydrology and hydraulic models to analyze impacts of project on watershed, including erosion and channel undercutting, which are current watershed issues.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>We oppose any additional concrete channelization or cover of San Clemente or Rose Creeks as inconsistent with the Assessment’s goal to enhance and improve the watershed. However, should new concrete be necessary in the channel under I-5 and SR 52, we urge SANDAG to mitigate through the removal of concrete elsewhere in the channel so there is a net gain (i.e., reduction in concrete cover) as result of the Mid-Coast Project. Also, importantly, any mitigation associate with impacts to Rose Canyon, San Clemente Canyon, or Lower Rose Creek, including city parks, must take place in impacted canyon or creek.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Assessment calls for the preservation and enhancement of recreation opportunities in the watershed. As proposed LRT alternatives parallel and/or cross existing Rose Canyon bicycle path, any impacts to the path or path users (including visual impacts and noise impacts) should be included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Key proposal of Assessment is to connect Clairemont and University City to Mission Bay, so pedestrians/cyclist within watershed could travel to bay without cross a street. Assessment Recommendation 2.5.3 proposes to achieve this by connecting existing Class 1 bicycle paths through watershed, including along Lower Rose Creek. Coastal Conservancy working with San Diego Bicycle Coalition to refine planning for this key trail connection, which will also serve as a portion of the California Coastal Trail through SD County. The footprints for this trail and the Mid Coast LRT alternatives run parallel to each other through Lower Rose Creek. Prelim analysis of the Assessment found that there is enough room in corridor for Mid Coast project and new bike/ped trail. However, critical that planning for both projects be coordinated and integrated - We urge SANDAG to work closely with the San Diego Bicycle Coalition and the RCW team. Doing so will allow the project to better meet goals/objectives, including: increasing transportation system capacity, as cyclists/peds can use trail to reach the trolley (and Mission Bay); reduce VMT and VHT, as the north/south route will provide a new, safe venue for bicycle commuters; and, improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Work with San Diego Bicycle Coalition and RCW team to refine the proposed trail and implement it as part of the project.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Evaluation criteria, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Directly related to creating new regional recreational connections is the need to implement safe and legal rail crossings in the watershed. Assessment Recommendation 2.5.5 addresses this and suggests alternative locations where crossings could occur. The current system of recreational users of the watershed constantly crossing the tracks is untenable, unsafe, and illegal. It is essential for public safety that SANDAG address this issue as part of the planning for the Mid Coast Project and the California Coastal Trail and implement safe legal crossings of the tracks. The Assessment recommends where crossings could occur; we urge SANDAG to work with the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition and the RCW team to refine these crossings further and implement them as part of the implementation of the Mid Coast.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Assessment proposes to enhance the watershed for people as well as animals. As a result of implementation of the Assessment, the watershed will become an even better place to recreate than it is today. Yet, the Mid Coast Project will have visual, noise, and other impacts on animals as well as people, potentially undermining the quality of the user experience. We request the Draft SEIS/SEIR address this both in the context of the user experience in the watershed today, but also how the user experience could be enhanced as a result of implementation of the Mid Coast Project. Furthermore, a key component to the user experience is the amount and variety of wildlife in the corridor. We therefore request that the impacts to wildlife viewing experiences both today and as a result of implementation of the Mid Coast Project be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR must address the cumulative impacts associated with the construction, operation, and long term maintenance of the Mid Coast Project, as well as all other proposed projects in the watershed. The projects include, but are not limited to: high speed rail; LOSSAN; Regents Road bridge; Coastal Rail Trail; Wet Weather Intermittent Stream Discharge Study; City of San Diego storm drain maintenance; I-5 improvements; and, AMTRAK improvements. The evaluation of cumulative impacts must include, but not be limited to: biology, hydrology, water quality, noise and vibration, wetlands, lighting, visual and aesthetic impacts, wildlife and ecosystems impacts (including sensitive, threatened, and endangered species), recreation, and impacts on Marion Bear Memorial Park, Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Lower Rose Creek, and the MSCP.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Ann Van Leer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft Comparative Eval of Alts Report does not provide sufficient detail on the footprint of the impacts, making it difficult to respond to scoping. We request that the Final Comparative Eval of Alts and Draft SEIS/SEIR be more user friendly, to include a high quality aerial, such as a Google Map, at a scale of at least 1:200 (preferably 1:100 and 1:200) for each alignment evaluated so that the public can review each section of the route in greater detail. This information could also be posted on the project website as an overlay on Google Earth, showing the area of impact from the centerline of each rail line to the right-of-way, and any additional limits of the impact, including construction impacts. Providing this information will help SANDAG, as the public will be able to better understand project impacts on the ground, allowing them to better direct their comments.</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Mel Hinton</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT 1 - As the SD Audubon supports the use of mass transit as an alternative to the expanded use of automobiles, we have considered the various route options for extending the LRT system to University City and the UCSD campus. Believe the LRT Alt 1 route, or a similar alt, is the best choice for the environment and ridership.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Mel Hinton</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Design of project, especially the selection of the preferred alternative, must consider a number of key factors: habitat loss, wildlife corridors, noise, wetlands, public recreational impacts, air and water pollution, impacts to scenic qualities, public safety, and related issues.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Mel Hinton</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Since Rose Creek parallels much of the proposed LRT alternatives, impacts to this waterway and its riparian habitat are of special concern. The LRT tracks should be located as far as possible from the creek, thus preserving existing habitat and avoiding expensive mitigation. In those areas where a concrete channel exists, such as the SR 52 interchange, every effort should be made to restore a natural creek bed and enhance wildlife corridors.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Mel Hinton</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Since LRT Alt 3 will have significant environmental impacts to Rose Canyon in addition to Rose Creek, it should be deleted from consideration in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Mel Hinton</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Our organization conducts public birding trips to Rose Canyon and is actively involved in the preservation of wildlife and natural habitat throughout San Diego County. We look forward to working with you on this project.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>There is a need for additional mass transit alternatives in the University City area. Improving access to transit in our neighborhoods will improve quality of life, reduce our impact on the environment, and facilitate economic development. The population of the University City is projected to grow considerably in the next two decades and in order to avoid gridlock on our streets, we must develop a mass transit system that is efficient, green, and attractive to riders. This project will help meet these needs.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1, No LRT Alt 3 - Support selection of LRT 1 (I-5 to UCSD to UTC) as the preferred alternative for environmental study, and the deletion of LRT 3 (Rose Canyon to UTC to UCSD) from further consideration.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Broad community consensus for LRT 1, which will ensure community support for project and improve chances for Federal funding.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Financial, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - There is strong community opposition to LRT 3.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1, No LRT Alt 3 - LRT 1 avoids impacts to Rose Canyon Open Space Park, whereas LRT 3 would have huge, immitigable impacts.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1, No LRT Alt 3 - LRT 1 is also the most cost-effective alternative presented, whereas LRT 3 is the least cost-effective LRT alt presented.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Sherri S. Lightner</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Environmental document should include, but not be limited to, study of the following impacts: noise, visual, environmental, property, parking, air quality, aesthetics, and traffic (including the construction phase).</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>San Diego Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Support LRT - Caltrans supports the project. Proposed LRT extension from Old Town to University City will provide new travel options and improve mobility within the congested 1-5 corridor.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Caltrans has worked successfully with MTDB, NCTD, and SANDAG to accommodate and permit portions of other regional LRT projects within or crossing the Caltrans right-of-way (R/W), while maintaining the R/W needed for future highway improvements. Such projects include the Trolley Green Line extension to SDSU and the SPRINTER. Experience gained from these past successes can be utilized in the coordination and permitting efforts necessary for the planning, design, and construction of this project.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Ok with LRT Alts - Based on the coordination over the years between Caltrans and SANDAG, Caltrans has no major concerns with locating the proposed project within the Caltrans R/W as planned. Continued cooperation as the details of the 1-5 proposed highway improvement projects and the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project are defined is anticipated to allow for the successful completion both projects, thus improving transportation capacity and options in the 1-5 corridor.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Any work performed within R/W requires discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and must be clearly identified and included in the environmental document. The identification of avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be a condition of the Caltrans encroachment permit approval as well as the procurement of any necessary regulatory and resource agency permits.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Improvement plans for construction within the State Highway R/W must include the appropriate engineering information consistent with the State code, and signed and stamped by a professional engineer registered in the State of California. The Caltrans Permit Manual contains a listing of typical information required for project plans.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Jacob M. Armstrong</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>All design and construction must be in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) activities.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Consider a multi-modal alternative (note: see attached map of proposed alternative). Mode 1 is an extension of the Trolley Blue Line north to the edge of the economically booming UTC/UCSD/BioTech cluster zone. Mode 2 is a zero-emission rubber-wheel electric trolley (note: see attached info sheet on “Fast-Charge Electric Trolley”), the “Gold Line” or “Golden Triangle Line,” running mostly on a fast, traffic-free dedicated/private right-of-way loop, connecting to the UTC Transit Center, Sorrento Valley Coaster Station, and Torrey Pines Research Mesa (note: see attached map of Torrey Mesa Research Institutes and attached info sheet on Torrey Pines Mesa “Strategic Location”). Advantages: provide better service to a larger community, less costly than the LRT-only alternatives, and, more flexible system to adapt to possible future needs.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>The thriving areas of University City, UCSD (note: see attached PPT slide titled “San Diego is a Cluster of Innovation”), and the surrounding BioTech cluster (note: see attached map of San Diego BioTech companies) have seen massive economic growth in recent decades. New start is needed to better integrate these areas into San Diego’s public transit system.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Although connecting the UTC/UCSD/BioTech cluster area with the LRT transit system to the south is an ideal solution, serving the cluster area with LRT is a terrible solution. Problems with LRT include the following: extremely costly to construct, such as new bridges and stations; comparatively noisy; has grade issues; not well-suited for the multi-directional and frequent stops needed by commuters in the area. As a result, LRT can only marginally satisfy the latent demand for public transit connectivity within the cluster area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Ken Daniszewski</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Written</td>
<td>Proposed multi-modal alt consists of an extension of the existing Trolley Blue Line to access the UTC/UCSD/BioTech cluster area, augmented with a new Gold Line, a rubber-wheel, electric trolley system with its own dedicated right-of-way. Multi-modal alt would have the following advantages: Gold Line eligible for FTA New Starts funding; improved access to rail transit for major employers in the area, including the Scripps Research and Salk Institutes (note: see attached info sheet titled “Sanford Consortium Breaks Ground”), Scripps Green Hospital, and California Institute of Regenerative Medicine; faster and significantly less expensive to build than LRT; COASTER-related improvements, including a convenient south-bound connection/transfer to the UTC Transit Center from the Sorrento Valley Station, no more Sorrento Valley COASTER shuttles stuck in traffic, and improved COASTER access for north-bound riders, such as people working in UTC; potential to reduce rush hour traffic north of UCSD, on the I-5, 101, and Genesee Ave; improved transit options within cluster area, which will stimulate economic growth; improved neighborhood livability, due to reduced driving and congestion; and, reduced environmental contamination from autos. Additionally, transfer delays from Blue to Gold Line can be minimized in a well-designed system.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Alignments, Environmental impacts, Financial, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Genesee Highlands HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Gerry Senda</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT, No LRT Alt 3 - At May 26, 2010 Genesee Highlands HOA Board meeting, Board unanimously passed a resolution on behalf of the HOA in support of the trolley to UCSD and UTC but opposing LRT Alt 3 through Rose Canyon. Consistent with resolution passed in November 2009, which supported high speed train but opposed high speed train tracks in Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Genesee Highlands HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Gerry Senda</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Genesee Highlands is a condo community of 502 units sited on 65 acres on the northern edge of Rose Canyon, immediately west of Genesee Ave. Roughly 1,000 people or more live in Genesee Highlands.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Genesee Highlands HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Sierra Club fully supports SANDAG’s efforts to ensure improved mobility and accessibility around centers in the Mid-Coast Corridor in order to support smart growth and economic development within the region.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>“The purpose of an environmental impact report is to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a project.” Pub. Res. Code § 21061. To achieve a competitive transit system while maintaining the environmental integrity of the region, it is our recommendation that SANDAG draft an SEIR of the highest quality providing both decision-makers and the public a full opportunity to understand and analyze the Project’s environmental repercussions.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Our concerns center on the Project’s lack of cohesion with respect to San Diego County’s current transit infrastructure and SANDAG’s SB375 responsibility to reduce driving and comply with AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, to lower greenhouse gas emissions (“GHG”). The Project fails to provide a holistic approach to solving San Diego County’s transportation problems. The current Project model is fragmented from SANDAG’s GHG reduction responsibilities under SB375, the state’s responsibility to continue to maintain roads with the decreasing gas-tax accounts that will result from Pavely 1 and Pavely 2’s CO2-per-mile reduction mandates, and the rest of San Diego’s transportation system. Therefore, the Project model does not take into account a range of other available transportation alternatives and strategies.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Purpose and need, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>SANDAG’s failure to clearly define the concept of a “competitive transit system” also provides an area of contention. What is the barometer upon which competitiveness is measured? In order to comply with the standards set out by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA’), the SEIR will need to clearly analyze competitive trip times with drive times. It is SANDAG’s duty to engage in a critical examination of the MTS market research, highlighting that San Diegans will only change their trip preferences (from automobiles to mass transit) when transit trip times are competitive with driving times. This should be reflected in the mode change calculations.</td>
<td>Requests for information, Evaluation criteria, Purpose and need</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>In order to meet CEQA obligations, SANDAG must provide an adequate range of alternatives. CEQA requires that an EIR describe alternatives that would feasibly attain the project’s objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s significant impacts. See, Pub. Res. Code § 21100(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(c). For example, noticeably absent from the proposed SEIR is an adequate investigation into alternatives which may identify BRT as a competitive alternative to LTR. The failure to account for such a competitive alternative leads to an inadequate estimate of ridership comparisons with the trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed SEIR lacks consideration of various other strategies that could reasonably achieve the objective of increased ridership while reducing significant environmental impacts, including, but not limited to, a reduction of VMT. Specifically, the proposed SEIR fails to consider the most powerful, short-term, price-constrained strategies to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks, as required by SB375. SANDAG should consider investigating current strategies proposed internationally by the Netherlands (2014), Denmark (2016), and domestically by Nevada (<a href="http://www.vmtfeenv.com/">http://www.vmtfeenv.com/</a>), in addition to the strategy fully tested in Oregon. The proposed SEIR fails to coalesce with the directives outlined by SANDAG’s own RTP Guidelines, “[t]o reduce VMT, MPOs should model adding pricing to existing lanes, not just as a means for additional expansion. Variable/congestion pricing should be considered.” (<a href="http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs">http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs</a> RTP/2010_RTP_Guidelines.pdf.) The proposed SEIR also fails to model the pricing of parking, even though SANDAG’s own Guidelines recommend such consideration. Modeling the pricing of driving and parking will increase the cost effectiveness of transit, by greatly increasing ridership.</td>
<td>Purpose and need</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed SEIR should contain an alternative that has both the commuter rail and LRT or BRT option. The commuter rail option would effectively add a COASTER stop under UTC and reduce the COASTER/Amtrak travel time from Oceanside to San Diego. It is an alternative that competes with the I-5 expansion. CEQA requires all environmental impact reports to analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts pursuant to CEQA sections 15355 and 15358. Hence, it is inadequate that this proposed SEIR does not identify the simultaneous and linked DEIR on the proposed RTP 2030 I-5 expansion. This CALTRANS project has received generous media and public attention and it is incumbent upon SANDAG staff to be informed about both of the aforementioned projects and to account for them within their environmental review document. The commuter rail option is more expensive than the other alternatives in the proposed SEIR. However, if these two on-going EIR efforts were linked together, as required by law, it might be found that the commuter rail project could save money by effectively replacing and/or scaling-back the very expensive I-5 widening project. CEQA requires an EIR to summarize the main points of disagreement among related issues, in order to ensure good faith efforts at full compliance. See Pub.Res.Code, §§ 21083, 21061, 2100; See also, San Francisco Ecology Center v. County of San Francisco, 48 Cal.App.3d 584 (1975).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed scope of the SEIR lacks appropriate identification and investigation into all reasonably feasible alternatives. Under CEQA, every EIR must describe a range of alternatives to a proposed project, and to its location, that would feasibly attain the project’s basic objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s significant impacts. Pub.Res.Code § 21100(b)(4); CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(a); see Citizens of Goleta Valley, 52 Cal.3d at 564-65.</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The court in Laurel Heights Improvement Ass’n v. Regents of University of California, “[w]ithout meaningful analysis of alternatives in the EIR, neither the courts nor the public can fulfill their proper roles in the CEQA process…[Courts will not] countenance a result that would require blind trust by the public, especially in light of CEQA’s fundamental goal that the public be fully informed as to the consequences of action by their public officials.” 47 Cal.3d 376 at 404. The limited discussion regarding the stated alternatives is such that the SEIR is incapable of providing the public and decision makers with the necessary information to comply with CEQA. The law further demands that SANDAG draft a comprehensive, information document in order for the public to provide decision-makers with meaningful feedback; therefore there must be full disclosure of all modeling assumptions for each alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed SEIR would fall short of fulfilling CEQA’s mandate of identifying an environmentally superior alternative. CEQA Guidelines§ 15126.6(e)(2). Hence, the SEIR must reevaluate and provide a reasonable range of alternatives that reduce the potential significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>None of the alternatives recognize the advantage of BRT to move off the dedicated “rapid transit” guide way directly onto the streets as a means of achieving travel conventionality. For example, BRT buses running on the designated bus lanes have the unique capacity to provide transit service directly to community residents bordering the I-5; specifically, Pacific Beach, Clairemont, La Jolla, and University City. BRT buses could also connect to the employment centers of Sorrento Valley, western Mira Mesa, and on Miramar Road. The result being that BRT would transport passengers along all of the LRT routes while serving a greater number of individuals who currently use the MTS bus routes within these communities; incentivizing the use of existing mass transit infrastructure translating to a reduction in GHG emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>According to an article published by the Energy Policy Initiatives Center at USD, “reaching the overall 2050 target of reducing the GHGs 80% below 1990 levels will require more aggressive policies from the on-road transportation category.” (<a href="http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghg/policy/documents/ES_GHG_Policy_On-Road_FINAL.pdf">http://www.sandiego.edu/epic/ghg/policy/documents/ES_GHG_Policy_On-Road_FINAL.pdf</a>).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The recently adopted CEQA amendments further instruct lead agencies to engage in a thorough analysis of GHG emissions in their environmental review documents and to mitigate the impact of GHGs when applicable in order to achieve AB32 target reductions.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>It would be useful for SANDAG staff to review the Sierra Club’s national policy on the rail/bus controversy at <a href="http://sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/trans.aspx">http://sierraclub.org/policy/conservation/trans.aspx</a>. Of particular importance is the finding that, “walking and bicycling are best, along with electronic communications to reduce trips. Next are buses, minibuses, light rail and heavy rail (as corridor trips increase); electrified wherever feasible. Rail systems are most effective in stimulating compact development patterns, increasing public transit patronage, and reducing motor vehicle use. Station access should be provided by foot, bicycle, and public transit, with minimal, but full-priced, public parking. Accommodation of pedestrians, bicycles, and public transit should be given priority over private automobiles.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The calculation for User Benefit Hours (&quot;UBH&quot;) adds transfer time to switch modes from the Trolley to the BRT at Old Town, which translates into an additional penalty for transfer time from BRT to local buses at the Mid-Coast stations. Correspondingly, LRT riders on the same route are charged only for the one transfer at the Mid-Coast station (this is according to the briefing at the PWG workshop on March 29). The significant discrepancy between baseline calculations for UBH in respect to LRT and BRT is highly prejudicial and the resulting comparative analysis is inherently flawed. In order to satisfy CEQA the SIER, must recalculate the UBH for LRT and BRT using a consistent baseline.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The current alternatives analysis is predicated on a “corridor” model that fails to consider integration with the existing bus system. The analysis lacks any modeling which would add necessary shuttle service to adjacent communities and employment centers in order to achieve the objective of transit mobility and encourage smart growth design (other than UCSD and the Golden Triangle region). According to an e-mail from SANDAG staff, the modeling behind the UBH’s values overlay on the existing region’s MTS routes falls short of providing a systematic analysis of the impacts without consideration to the alternatives proposed by the LRT with regard to existing bus feeder routes. If the SEIR is unable to broaden its range of alternatives in this area, the result will be an insufficient CEQA document. The model will provide an unrealistic result because once the Mid-Coast system is in place there will be obvious changes to the MTS bus routes that will yield more efficient overall travel. For example, the MTS grid used in the modeling considered that a transit user in central La Jolla would use the #30 bus to get to Pacific Beach and then the #27 to get to the Balboa Mid-Coast station. An individual traveling to downtown San Diego would incur a third additional penalty in UBH (transfers at Mission and Garnet, Balboa Mid-Coast, and Old Town). This aspect of the modeling partly explains why there are such low numbers of Mid-Coast trips initiated in and ending in La Jolla according to the alternatives study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The BRT alternatives in the proposed model originate from Downtown San Diego. Relying on this designation imposes a penalty on riders originating on the Trolley system south of downtown, as they are forced to interchange with the existing Trolley at the Old Town transit center. To support an efficient transit system, utilizing BRT, the SEIR should conduct a model where transfers are designated at Old Town as opposed to the downtown area. Therefore alleviating areas where the BRT must overcome significant traffic congestion, for example Broadway and Pacific Highway.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Evaluation criteria, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Project makes no effort to consider an alternative that is convenient for individuals traveling to the south. For example, an individual traveling from Torrey Pines, Del Mar, or Mira Mesa would have to park and ride the Trolley to Downtown San Diego. This would likely be a common travel problem, similar to today’s problem of going on the I-5 to Old Town, parking and riding the Trolley downtown. As such, the presently proposed alternatives analysis provides no less environmentally damaging alternative while simultaneously failing to achieve the Project’s stated objective of transit mobility and smart growth design. The Project will continue to necessitate transit users to drive to the LRT or BRT transit centers with an unmitigated increase in GHG emissions.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter strongly supports the comments submitted by The Friends of Rose Creek with regard to the proposed extension of the Trolley to the north of Old Town, heading towards north University City along Rose Creek. This area is a one of San Diego’s precious nature resources.</td>
<td>Alternatives, General comment, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Join with The Friends of Rose Creek in recommending that: the Project engage in NO additional channelization, culverting, or undergrounding of any stretch of Rose Creek to accommodate the trolley.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Join with The Friends of Rose Creek in recommending that: all mitigation for trolley impacts to Rose Creek, south of SR 52 and north of Santa Fe Street, shall be preformed within the geographical location where the impacts occur.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Join with The Friends of Rose Creek in recommending that, with respect to mitigation opportunities utilized for trolley impacts, use those identified by the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance Opportunities Assessment, which include, but are not limited to, the following: safe and legal railroad crossings to allow residents of University City, Clairemont, and Pacific Beach to move freely within these communities on foot and on bicycle (thus, offsetting the Project’s GHGs); restoration of any degraded habitats; removal of existing concrete culverts/channels where feasible; and, design and development of new trails to support visitor enjoyment of the area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Pamela Epstein</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>It is kindly requested that SANDAG take note of the comments offered throughout this letter, as mandated by CEQA. At this time, the Sierra Club would like to again show its support for an effective and efficient holistic approach to increased transit mobility and smart growth design. The comments herein are offered in an effort to achieve SANDAG’s ultimate objective in an environmentally conscious manner. In closing, it is strongly encouraged that every effort be made to fully comply with the letter and spirit of the CEQA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General comment Sierra Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>John Lucas</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>I know the project is a large amount of money, something over $1 Billion. Every dollar the government spends today, no matter how it gets out to this project, they have to borrow 43 cents. I feel that my great grandchildren will be paying for this project.</td>
<td>Costs, Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>John Lucas</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Worked in Pennsylvania railroads long ago. Lots of experience out in the track. Back East, we used to have self-propelled cars that would haul 100 - 150 people. I am wondering if we could run these cars from Old Town to Gilman Drive. Self-propelled cars go back and forth on double track - wouldn’t need new tracks. Just hook up buses (note: at Gilman Dr) and service everyone in a great big circle. It would probably be a lot, lot cheaper and could be in operation in a short amount of time.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>John Lucas</td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>They’ve talked about running the Trolley around in a big circle downtown, where you would come in from Old Town and San Ysidro. Instead of having 4 cars blocking the intersections, you would have 2 cars and run them every 10 or 15 minutes. Maybe free downtown, like Portland, where they’ve had a lot of success. SANDAG had a big article in the newspaper months ago - the merchants like it but never heard another word.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I oppose LRT 3 because of environmental effects. I love Rose Canyon and think that it needs to continue to be protected and kept in its pristine state.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>LRT Alt 6 has operational difficulties in terms of the curves and turns.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - It makes sense to me that LRT Alt 1 is the alternative that should be pursued.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Everett DeLano</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The NOP identifies several “previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decision for the Mid-Coast Corridor.” These documents, as well as the resolutions approving previous decisions, should be made available on SANDAG’s website.</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Everett DeLano</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>While the NOP discusses the need for “supplemental” environmental review, it is unclear just what SANDAG intends to “supplement.” This should be made clear in the EIS/EIR.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Everett DeLano</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>A May 2010 “Scoping Information Brochure” issued by SANDAG claims that the “purpose and need for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project focuses on improving mobility and accessibility and attracting transit-supportive land uses and economic development to smart growth centers in the Mid-Coast Corridor.” This purpose and need should be defined clearly in the EIS/EIR. Furthermore, the EIS/EIR should provide a clear description and depiction of where these “smart growth centers” are to be located and how and when they will be developed.</td>
<td>Requests for information, Purpose and need</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Everett DeLano</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The EIS/EIR should address the following: scope of the project; all phases of project development, including other phases and sections of the transit system; construction impacts, including impacts associated with slow-moving and heavy equipment; land use impacts, including existing general plan and municipal code requirements and existing uses in the surrounding area; traffic impacts, including impacts associated with inducing travel; noise impacts to surrounding uses, including nearby neighborhoods, parks and habitat uses, and impacts associated with destruction of on-site vegetation; light impacts to surrounding uses, including nearby neighborhoods, parks, and habitat uses; toxics and human health impacts, including impacts associated with construction and airborne contamination during construction; water and air quality impacts, including impacts associated with existing on-site contamination; water supply impacts; historical and cultural resource impacts, including impacts associated with destruction of existing features on the site; cumulative impacts; global warming impacts; adequate and verifiable mitigation for Project impacts; consideration of mitigation that includes open space acquisition in and around Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Park; and, an adequate range of alternatives, including alternatives that avoid parkland like Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Park, as well as “no project” alternative that is consistent with existing uses and existing conditions in the Project vicinity.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need, Schedule, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Everett DeLano</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Please ensure that I am provided a copy of the Draft EIS/EIR and any notice regarding the project.</td>
<td>Requests for information, Public involvement</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The DSEIS should explore and objectively evaluate a range of reasonable alts, including the No Action Alternative, and briefly discuss reasons for eliminating some alternatives from further evaluation (40 CFR 1502.14). EPA recommends that the DSEIS include a summary of the screening methodology that was used to determine the range of alternatives for inclusion in the DSEIS. The methodology summary should include information about which criteria and measures were used at each screening level and how they were integrated in a comprehensive evaluation. The DSEIS should also include a description of alts that were considered but withdrawn with a summary of why they were eliminated.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The DSEIS should also identify opportunities for the alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts while fulfilling the project purpose. This may include alignment shifts, buffers, localized design modifications, changes in construction practices, or spanned crossings of sensitive biological resources. There is a likely need for a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit for the discharge of fill in waters of the US for the project. This will require documentation that a reasonable range of alternatives were analyzed in order to comply with CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Compliance with the 404(b)(1) Guidelines will require that a range of alternatives be evaluated before determining the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Project located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The area is federally designated Subpart 1 Basic nonattainment area for the 1997 8-hr ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS), and a maintenance area for the CO NAAQS [40 CFR Par 81]. Because of the area’s nonattainment status, the DSEIS should specifically identify measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, including nitrogen oxides, resulting from the project. It is also important to reduce emissions of mobile source air toxics (MSAT) and particulate matter from this project to the maximum extent. Recommendations: Ambient Conditions: The DSEIS should include a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions (i.e., baseline or existing conditions), the area’s attainment or nonattainment status for all NAAQS, and potential air quality impacts (including cumulative and indirect impacts) from the construction and operation of the project for each fully evaluated alternative. The DSEIS should include estimates of all criteria pollutant emissions and diesel particulate matter (DPM). EPA also recommends that the DSEIS disclose the available info about the health risks associated with construction and truck emissions and how the proposed project will affect current emission levels. Relevant Requirements: The DSEIS should describe any applicable local, state, or federal requirements. The DSEIS should describe applicable requirements for Federal Actions that require FTA or FHWA</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 442 (continued) |                   |      |                   | funding or approval and are subject to the Transportation Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A and for Federal Actions that are subject to the General Conformity requirements in 40 CFR part 93, subpart B.  
  
Conformity: The DEIS should ensure that the emission from both the construction and the operational phases of the project conform to the approved State Implementation Plan and do not cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS. To meet the transportation conformity requirements, the DSEIS should demonstrate that the project is included in a conforming transportation plan and transportation improvement program.  
  
Construction: The responsible agency should include a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in the DSEIS and adopt this plan in the ROD. In addition to all applicable local, state, or federal requirements, EPA recommends that the following mitigation measures be included in the Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan in order to reduce impacts associated with emissions of particulate matter (PM) and other toxics from construction-related activities:  
  
    Fugitive Dust Source Controls: stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative, where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions; install wind fencing and phase grading operations, where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions; and, when hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 mph. Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph.  
  
    Mobile and Stationary Source Controls: minimize use, trips, and unnecessary idling of heavy equipment; maintain and tune engines per manufacturer’s specifications to perform at EPA certification levels, where appropriate, and to perform at verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established |       |             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>442 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specifications. CARB has a number of mobile source anti-idling requirements which could be employed. See their website (note: link provided); prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer’s recommendations; if practicable, lease new, clean (diesel or retrofitted diesel) equipment meeting the most stringent of applicable Federal (note: see footnote) or State Standards (note: see footnote). In general, commit to the best available emissions control technology. Tier 4 engines should be used for project construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible (note: see footnote). Lacking availability of non-road construction equipment that meets Tier 4 engine standards, FTA should commit to using the best available emissions control technologies on all equipment; and, utilize EPA-registered particulate traps and other appropriate controls where suitable to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Controls: identify all commitment to reduce construction emissions and update the air quality analysis to reflect additional air quality improvements that would result from adopting specific air quality measures; identify where implementation of mitigation measures is rejected based on economic infeasibility; prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the sustainability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking. (Suitability of control devices is based on: whether there is reduced normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime and/or power output, whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engine, or whether there may be significant risk to nearby workers or the public). Meet CARB diesel fuel requirement for off-road and on-highway (i.e., 15 ppm), and, where appropriate, use alternative fuel sources, such as natural gas and electric power; develop a construction traffic and parking management plan that minimizes traffic interference and maintains traffic flow; and, indentify sensitive receptors in the project area, such as children, elderly, and infirm, and specify the means by which you will minimize impacts to these populations. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to building and air conditioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>State of California has increased its focus on potential climate change and impacts of increasing GHG emissions. Specifically, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and EO S-3-05 recognize the impact that climate change can have within California and provide direction for future reductions of GHGs. In fact, the Natural Resources Agency recently adopted Amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for GHG emissions on Dec 30, 2009, which became effective on Mar 18, 2010 (note: see footnote). SB 375 is aimed at curbing sprawl and reducing VMT in an effort to cut GHG emissions. SB 375 requires MPOs to develop a “sustainable communities strategy” (SCS), which demonstrates how the region will meet GHG emission reduction targets set by CARB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>State of California is a 2009 recipient of EPA’s Smart Growth Implementation Assistance (SGIA). California requested assistance in developing a local govt sustainable community framework to provide guidance to local jurisdictions in determining which combination of GHG emission reduction strategies, smart growth practices, and sustainability policies are best for their communities. At the Federal level under the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, EPA, the US Dept of Housing and Urban Development, and the USDOT are working together to help improve protecting the environment in communities nationwide, with the two later assisting EPA in implementing the SGIA for State of California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>EPA recommends that, as practicable, the DSEIS identify the cumulative contributions to GHG emissions that will result from implementation of the project. In addition, we recommend that the DSEIS discuss the potential impacts of climate change on the project and describe how the project meets the intent of statewide and national sustainability initiatives and goals to develop sustainable communities. Finally, DSEIS should identify if there are specific mitigation measures needed to 1) protect the project from the effects of climate change, 2) reduce the project’s adverse air quality effects, and/or 3) promote pollution prevention and environmental stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The DSEIS should explore the extent to which proposed alternatives will integrate with existing transportation facilities. Document should discuss how the project will impact existing vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths due to project construction or operation. All potential alternatives should identify the opportunities available to better connect all modes of transportation, including heavy rail, light rail, BRT, standard bus service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Measures to minimize or mitigate impacts to vehicle lanes, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian paths should be addressed in DSEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>EPA encourages FTA and SANDAG to implement “green infrastructure,” such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips in any onsite stormwater management features. These features can serve as both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements (note: see link for more info).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>For the construction of new infrastructure, EPA recommends industrial materials recycling, or the reusing or recycling of byproduct materials generated from industrial processes. Nonhazardous industrial materials, such as coal ash, foundry sand, construction and demolition materials, slags, and gypsum, are valuable products of industrial processes. Industrial materials recycling preserves natural resources by decreasing the demand for virgin materials, conserves energy, and reduces GHG emissions by decreasing the demand for products made from energy intensive manufacturing processes; and saves money by decreasing disposal costs for the generator and decreasing materials costs for end users. EPA recommends that, for any new construction proposed, the DSEIS identify how industrial materials recycling can be incorporated into project design (note: see link for more info).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Given that the project will cross the SD River, Tecolote Creek, and Rose Creek, and is proximity to San Clement Creek and Mission Bay, this project may involve the discharge of dredged or fill materials into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways. Discharges of dredged or fill materials into waters of the US require authorization by the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA. Federal Guidelines at 40 CFR Part 230 promulgated under CWA Section 404 (b)(1) provide substantive environmental criteria that must be met to permit such discharges into waters of the US. These criteria require a permitted discharge to: 1) be the LEDPA; 2) avoid causing or contributing to a violation of a State water quality standard; 3) avoid jeopardizing a federally listed species or adversely modifying designated critical habitat for a federally listed species; 4) avoid causing or contributing to significant degradation of the waters of the US; and, 5) mitigate for unavoidable impacts to waters. A fully integrated DSEIS that adequately addresses these criteria would facilitate the CWA Section 404 permit review process. EPA recommends integrating NEPA and CWA Section 404 requirements in the development of the DSEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The waters assessment should be of an appropriate scope and detail to identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with functions highly susceptible to change. EPA also recommends the following in the DSEIS for the assessment of existing conditions and environmental consequences of each proposed alternative: include the classification of waters and the geographic extent of waters and any adjacent riparian areas; characterize the functional condition of waters and any adjacent riparian areas; include wildlife species affected that could reasonably be expected to use waters or associated riparian habitat and sensitive plant taxa that are associated with water or associated riparian habitat; analyze the potential flood flow alteration; analyze the potential water quality impact and potential effect to designated uses; and, address techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>To demonstrate compliance with CWA Guidelines, the DSEIS should identify measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. Temporary and permanent impacts to waters of the US for each alternative studies should be quantified; for example, acres of water impacted, etc. For each alternative, the DSEIS should report these numbers in table form for each impacted water and wetland feature. The DSEIS should address techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces. The project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and an accompanying Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Where the proposed project will expand or add new impervious surfaces, the current stormwater detention basins and structures may no longer be effective. Recommendations: Because the project crosses the SD River, Tecolote Creek, and Rose Creek, the water quality analysis in the DSEIS should include an estimate of increase in impervious surfaces, estimates of increases in stormwater runoff locations and volume, and locations for specific design features to minimize discharges and dissipate energy. The DSEIS should identify specific locations, on a map, where runoff is expected, along with a map indicating where specific design features for stormwater management will be placed (bioswales, etc.). These options should be presented as a part of the DSEIS process and not deferred until a later stage; include storm water performance standards for both construction site sediment control and post-construction project design standards in the DSEIS and ROD; provide info regarding the placement, selection, and performance of proposed BMPs in the DSEIS; commit to design, install, and maintain BMPs to control total suspended solids (TSS) carried in runoff post-construction of the project; and, commit to employ BMPs to maintain or reduce the peak runoff discharge rates, to the maximum extent practicable, as compared to the pre-development conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>On April 10, 2008, EPA and the USACE issued revised regulations, “Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule” (Mitigation Rule) (40 CFR 230), governing compensatory mitigation for authorized impacts to wetlands, streams, and other waters of the US under Section 404 of the CWA. These regulations are designed to improve the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation to replace lost aquatic resource functions and area and include a mitigation hierarchy with an inherent preference for mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs before the use of an on-site mitigation site. Recommendations: 1) Include discussions in the DSEIS to reflect current regulations (note: see link to final Mitigation Rule, effective June 9, 2008). Ensure that all mitigation proposed for waters of the US is in compliance with the Mitigation Rule. 2) Discuss mitigation for temporary and unavoidable indirect impacts. Temporary impact mitigation should consider additional compensatory mitigation for temporal loss of functions, as well as establishing numeric criteria and monitoring of the temporary impact site to ensure that aquatic functions are fully restored. Indirect impact mitigation should consider opportunities to reduce any potential effects from shading and to compensate for possible wetland habitat fragmentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Susan Sturges</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The DSEIS should identify whether the proposed alternative may disproportionately and adversely affect low income or minority populations in the surrounding area and should provide appropriate mitigation measure for any adverse impacts. EO 12898 addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low income populations, and the Council on Environmental Quality has developed guidance concerning how to address Environmental Justice in the environmental review process (note: see link). Community involvement activities supporting the project should include opportunities for incorporating public input, especially in Environmental Justice communities, into the facility area design process to promote context sensitive design. In addition, the DSEIS should demonstrate compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which, in part, would include analyses for service equity and fare equity. Recommendations: 1) Identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low income or minority populations and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts. Assessment of the project's impacts should reflect consultation with affected populations and mitigation measures should be considered, where feasible, to avoid, mitigate, minimize, rectify, reduce, or eliminate impacts associated with a proposed project (See 40 CFR § 1508.20). Mitigation measures identified in the DSEIS should reflect the needs and preferences of the affected low-income and minority populations to the extent practicable. 2) Document the process used for community involvement and communication, including all measures to specifically outreach to potential environmental justice communities. Include an analysis of results achieved by reaching out to these populations. EPA has developed a model plan for public participation that may assist FTA in this effort (note: see link for plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts, Public involvement</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Cecilia Gallardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Dave Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Ken Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Ken Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Ken Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Ken Crocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Sarah Gille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Joe LaCava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Joe LaCava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Joe LaCava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Joe LaCava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Joe LaCava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Meryl Falkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Brian Hassler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Brian Hassler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Brian Hassler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Charles Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Charles Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Charles Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals and Objectives (p. S-4 - S-5)

Livability: Smarter growth land uses implies increased density. This can in turn decrease rather than increase livability if the project destroys open space parks and other natural areas that contribute to the quality of life in an increasingly dense urban environment.

Sustainability: “Limit potential impacts to sensitive habitats.”

P. 2-1 states that the SANDAG Regional Policy Objectives considered important in an LPA (Table 2-2) include: “Limit impacts to sensitive habitats.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3 through Rose Canyon would severely impact much of Rose Canyon Open Space Park with both direct and indirect impacts, including parklands/recreation areas, visual and aesthetic, natural resources, noise and vibration, wetlands, and neighborhood character. The park is a long, fairly narrow canyon. The LRT 3 would be clearly visible and audible from everywhere in the park, and has projected 7.5-minute headways in 2030. The project would require major grading and retaining walls for another set of tracks, catenary poles and wires, and, it appears, fencing. LRT 3 would have: - by far the greatest # of linear feet adjacent to parklands (5-79) (14,234 for LRT 3 vs. 4,923 for LRT 1) - by far the greatest # of linear feet of wetland impacts (p. 5-62) (9,070 for LRT 3 vs. 6,844 for LRT 1) - by far the greatest impact on listed species habitat (p. 5-56) (212 acres for LRT 3 vs. 131 acres for LRT 1)</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3 would conflict with the City of San Diego’s stated purpose for its open space parks. The City of San Diego’s webpage on Open Space Parks states: “Open Space within the City of San Diego is defined as areas generally free from development or developed with low intensity uses that respect natural environmental characteristics. Open Space Parks are used for purposes such as preservation of natural resources, passive outdoor recreation and scenic and visual enjoyment.” As a regional resource, Rose Canyon Open Space Park is used by people from all over San Diego, who come to bike, hike, jog, birdwatch, enjoy nature, and participate in volunteer restoration projects and scout projects.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>LRT 3 would conflict with the increasing use of Rose Canyon Open Space Park by schools for educational field trips. About 4500 students attend the four schools within walking distance of Rose Canyon Open Space Park (Spreckels Bilingual Magnet Elementary, Curie Elementary, Standley Middle School, University City High School). These schools bring hundreds of students a year to the park for educational field trips, with the number increasing. These field trips require no buses, and thus reduce GHG emissions and reduce cost to the schools at a time when budgets are being cut. They thus support the Mid-coast Project’s goals of Livability and Sustainability.</td>
<td>Alternatives, General comment, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Alternatives Analysis severely underestimates the visual and noise impacts of LRT 3 on Rose Canyon Open Space Park by citing the presence of the existing rail tracks and Amtrak, Coaster and freight operations. The visual impacts due to LRT 3 would be far greater, requiring major grading, large retaining walls, another set of tracks, presumably fencing, plus poles and catenary wires, and frequent passage of trolleys. The noise impacts would also be vastly greater. Currently the Coaster runs primarily during rush hour on weekdays, does not run on Sunday, and has a very reduced schedule on Saturday. Freights run at night. Thus the visual and noise impact of the existing trains on park users is far less than the impact were the trolley to be added.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Although LRT 3 would have the greatest impacts, all LRT alternatives would have substantial impacts in combination with other projects. 1. The SEIS/SEIR should study the cumulative impacts of any proposed alignment on the Rose Creek watershed, including Rose Canyon, Rose Canyon Open Space Park, San Clemente Canyon, Marion Bear Memorial Park, and the entire length of Rose Creek. The cumulative impacts analysis should include the cumulative direct and indirect impacts of construction, operation and maintenance activities of the Mid-Coast Corridor in combination with and relation to past, present and future projects, including, but not limited to the following:  • The proposed High Speed Rail (HSR) project alignment along the existing railroad tracks from Miramar Road by MCAS Miramar to Old Town</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposed Regents Road bridge project (see Attachments for comment letters on environmental issues related to impacts on Rose Canyon)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Double tracking of the railroad tracks south of SR-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The City of San Diego’s Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s 2007 Miramar trunk sewer project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation project in Rose Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential sewer access paths by the City of San Diego’s Metropolitan Wastewater Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Storm water maintenance activities included in the City of San Diego’s Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program Final EIR, including potential impacts due to mitigation projects in the Rose Creek watershed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New development anticipated by or associated with the Mid-Coast Corridor Project and the HSR project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The cumulative impacts analysis should comprehensively study the following areas of impact: Biology; hydrology; wetlands; water quality; landform alteration, including new access roads, grading and retaining walls; wildlife habitat, movement, and wildlife corridor impacts; the MSCP; noise; vibrations; visual and aesthetic impacts; sensitive and threatened and endangered species; existing and future recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marion Bear Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bikeway); impacts on the Rose Creek watershed (including Mission Bay); archeological and cultural impacts; neighborhood character. The discussion of wildlife should include the loss or degradation of habitat, and habitat fragmentation impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New development anticipated by or associated with the Mid-Coast Corridor Project and the HSR project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. The cumulative impacts analysis should study the traffic impacts, including induced traffic and increases in traffic on local streets due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project-related TOD, parking, and stations. The traffic impacts should include the potential of the Project to increase pressure for construction of additional paved surfaces and road construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 519        | Deborah Knight    | 6/1/2010| Letter            | Direct and indirect impacts of any of the LRT alternatives. This must include impacts of construction, operation and maintenance, including temporary or permanent access.  
1. The SEIS/SEIR should study all direct and indirect impacts on the Rose Creek watershed, including those listed under the cumulative impacts comment above: Biology; hydrology; wetlands; water quality; landform alteration, including new access roads, grading and retaining walls; wildlife habitat, movement, and wildlife corridor impacts; the MSCP; noise; vibrations; visual and aesthetic impacts; sensitive and threatened and endangered species; existing and future recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Marion Bear Park, and Rose Creek (including the Rose Creek bikeway); impacts on the Rose Creek watershed (including Mission Bay); archeological and cultural impacts; neighborhood character. The discussion of wildlife should include the loss or degradation of habitat, and habitat fragmentation impacts.  
2. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on the Metropolitan Wastewater Department’s current wetland and upland mitigation project in Rose Canyon.  
3. The SEIS/SEIR should analyze compatibility with the MSCP and direct and indirect impacts on MSCP areas in Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon.  
4. The SEIS/SEIR must describe in detail, including accurate satellite-image maps, the exact location of the Project, including access routes and construction areas of impact. The absence of any satellite image mapping in the Draft Comparative Analysis of Alternatives has made it extremely difficult for the public to comment fully in scoping comments. For example, we have tried to find out the exact location of the property listed as potential “parkland take”, and SANDAG has been unable to provide it.                                             | Alternatives, Requests for information, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts | Friends of Rose Canyon                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>519 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. The SEIS/SEIR should analyze direct and indirect impacts on Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park. Impacts include, but are not limited to: parkland, visual and aesthetic, natural resources, wildlife and ecosystems, endangered species, and recreational and educational uses of the parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on Rose Creek and the San Diego River, including environmental (water quality, threatened and endangered species, wetland habitat, the need to increase channelization or opportunities to decrease channelization).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. The SEIS/SEIR should study the direct and indirect impacts on the Rose Creek bike path and potential new recreational opportunities along Rose Creek south of SR 52. The bike path should be preserved, and the visual and aesthetic experience of riders (and walkers) on this path should be protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The SEIS/SEIR should study the compatibility of the alignment through Rose Canyon with the following: • University Community Plan, including landform, visual quality, view character and neighborhood character • Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment • City of San Diego General Plan</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The SEIS/SEIR should:</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Consider mitigation that includes open space acquisition in and around Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Fully analyze the impacts of any proposed mitigation, including any need for creating road access, and propose mitigation projects that avoid such impacts. For example, projects that rely on large numbers of volunteers might be an alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consider ways to reduce visual and noise impacts on the western end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park, such as with earthen berms. Another possibility would be to begin tunneling sooner for the tunnel under La Jolla Colony Drive, and construct a berm above it that would reduce noise impacts from I-5. Once the LRT emerges from the tunnel along the east side of I-5, a sound wall on the east side of the LRT alignment could reduce noise to the adjacent La Jolla Colony residences, the bike path, and Rose Canyon Open Space Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Deborah Knight</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The SEIS/SEIR should take into account the information in comment letters submitted on the UC North/South Transportation Corridor Project EIR and the research studies by Kevin Crooks on the impacts of habitat fragmentation in San Diego canyons.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>T. Becker-Varano, A. Bendett, K. Coleman, A. Epstein, K. Lazerson, M. Lolly, C. Soraghan, M. T. B. Whalen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>T. Becker-Varano, A. Bendett, K. Coleman, A. Epstein, K. Lazerson, M. Lolly, C. Soraghan, M. T. B. Whalen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>T. Becker-Varano, A. Bendett, K. Coleman, A. Epstein, K. Lazerson, M. Lolly, C. Soraghan, M. T. B. Whalen</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Alexandra Epstein</td>
<td>6/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I utilize SD's many open spaces, including Rose Canyon. Assisted in preservation of the 32nd Street Canyon Open Space.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>G. Chapman, D. Lander, Mira</td>
<td>6/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>G. Chapman, D. Lander, Mira</td>
<td>6/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>G. Chapman, D. Lander, Mira</td>
<td>6/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Gary Chapman</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We urgently need to preserve Rose Canyon as an oasis of open space within our urban area.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Elizabeth Rudee</td>
<td>6/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Oppose LRT 3 for routing through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue. I strongly urge you to delete this route altogether from consideration in the environmental study. Rose Canyon OS Park is used by people from all over San Diego for hiking, cycling, jogging and enjoying nature. Recent efforts on the part of the Children and Nature Collaborative in San Diego have incorporated this area into the Nearby Nature Program for school students. This alone is a big reason to leave this area alone for the study of nature by our young people, who are locked into non-nature and sedentary activities too often. There are 4 schools in the neighborhood surrounding Rose Canyon, roughly 4,500 students within walking distance of the park. They already use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature, an experience that, for many of these children, is one of the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife. It is a major wildlife corridor. The City of San Diego has already committed to its conservation, in order to protect its bio-diversity and the area's quality of life. Drop LRT 3 entirely from any consideration for a trolley route.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Fred Saxon</td>
<td>5/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Save Rose Canyon from further DESTRUCTION, noise, and environmental pollution. I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Fred Saxon</td>
<td>5/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Arnold, Arovas, Azucena, Baize, Cowen, Eisen, Fry, Hagstrom, Harris, Heleniak, Hofheimer, Hood, Jamalyaria, Kotenko, Krous, Leavenworth, Newman, Riffenburgh, Rigoli, Schramski, Tsimikas, Vazakas, Wu</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Arnold, Arovas, Azucena, Baize, Cowen, Eisen, Fry, Hagstrom, Harris, Heleniak, Hoffheimer, Hood, Jamalyaria, Krous, Leavenworth, Newman, Riffenburgh, Schramski, Tsimikas, Vazakas, Worcester, Wu</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Arnold, Arovas, Azucena, Baize, Cowen, Eisen, Fry, Hagstrom, Harris, Heleniak, Hofheimer, Hood, Jamalyaria, Krous, Newman, Riffenburgh, Schranski, Tsimikas, Vazakas, Worcester, Wu</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>Peter Worcester</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We strongly support improving mass transit system in San Diego. We cannot afford, either economically or environmentally, to keep adding lanes to our freeways.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Peter Worcester</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). Our canyons are among the jewels of SD, helping make our city one of the most attractive in the country. For far too long, we have treated our canyons as little more than routes for freeways and opportunities to build more condos and shopping centers. It is time that we appreciate and preserve the contributions made by our canyons to the beauty and livability of SD. We moved to SD in 1970, when Mission Valley was largely still open space. We would be the envy of every city in the country if we had had the foresight to preserve Mission Valley as parkland. Instead, all that we have is sprawl that is the envy of no one. No one in their right mind would want to stay in Hotel Circle, overlooking a multilane freeway, if they knew what it is really like. Urge you to delete the LRT 3 route through Rose Canyon from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Ed Baize</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>My family and I hike in Rose Canyon and we would hate to lose the beauty of this nature preserve.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Christine Harris</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>My family uses the canyon for recreational activity almost every day. Having a trolley run through it would completely destroy the joy we get from walking or running there. There are so few open spaces left in San Diego. Please don’t destroy this one.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Peter Newman</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Comment on LRT - While I am a strong supporter of efficient mass transit, I am also a strong supporter of our remaining scraps of urban open space. Please route the proposed trolley line away from Rose Canyon Open Space Park as much as possible. I grew up exploring and playing in this canyon, and am delighted to be able to share it with my children. While it is not exactly pristine currently, the added presence of the trolley traffic and infrastructure would detract greatly from the “wild” feel in the stretch from I-5 to Genessee Avenue.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Judith Hood</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Have lived near Rose Canyon for 41 years. My children/grandchildren have hiked and played in Rose Canyon since 1969. We like Rose Canyon the way it is, and so do the animals that live there. Over the years, there have been a lot of changes here, as is true everywhere. Used to have coyotes and could hear them howling. We haven't heard coyotes for a long time, maybe 20 years. Neighbors remember when bobcats roamed and drank from their swimming pool. Now we have this narrow stretch of canyon left that is somewhat as it has been for these past 41 years. A lot of people enjoy its semi-pristine natural beauty and hike in it. Please leave it the way it is now.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Michael Leavenworth</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts. Husband and I have lived in area for over 20 years and have watched it grow. Often use the park to hike and enjoy open space just steps away from our now busy high density living environment. Always appreciate watching wildlife and nature changing throughout year. It is the highlight of living in this neighborhood. Husband is a local teacher and has taken his 4th graders into the canyon. For many of his students, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life. Please do not destroy this very special place that is becoming rare to find in San Diego.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>L. Kotenko</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - Select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Amos Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - It is mad, and certainly anti-social, to consider routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). Delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study!</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Amos Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - For lack of anything better, support as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Note that even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Amos Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. Why would you want to contribute to the decimation and ruination of one of the few natural areas left in San Diego? Why?? People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Dilloway, Gottfredson, Green, Klima, Nielsen, Norris, Ramirez, Roch-Levecq, Yates</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Dilloway, Gottfredson, Green, Klima, Nielsen, Norris, Ramirez, Roch-Levecq, Yates</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Gottfredson, Green, Klima, Norris, Ramirez, Roch-Levecq, Yates</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Joan Green</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We need open spaces for our kids. We enjoy hiking in Rose Canyon and have visited the canyon at the evening walks to learn about animals and plant life. Please keep the canyon alive and well for our local children.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>M. Petrie</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. LRT 3 would, for no good reason, devastate Rose Canyon OS Park (one of the few open spaces left in San Diego, used by lots of San Diego residents, young to old).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>M. Petrie</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I strongly urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD, which would much better serve UC community destinations.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Christopher Nielsen</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over San Diego use this park to hike, bike, jog and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across San Diego attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many children, these field trips are among few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Christopher Nielsen</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alt 1 - In addition to the adverse environmental impact of LRT 3, please note the significant additional cost and likely delays due to the tunnel proposed in LRT 3 under Decoro Avenue. Tunnels under neighborhood streets will significantly increase noise and vibration for residents there and will be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate. The LRT 1 route is a much better alternative for all the residents in the southwestern &quot;section&quot; of the UTC area (and has better station placement as well -- after all, we want to use the trolley, too).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Judith Landau</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am absolutely in favor of public transportation, but oppose routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Judith Landau</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - I believe the best trolley alternative is the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD, as long as the environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek are mitigated.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Judith Landau</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>We cycle at least once a week along Rose Canyon and are among the many local residents who treasure this remnant of nature in the city.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Kristin Kistler</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Ave (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Kristin Kistler</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. Even this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Memorial Park and along Rose Creek that will require mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Kristin Kistler</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3) would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, with huge noise, visual, and other environmental impacts: new tracks, plus poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. People from all over SD use this park to hike, bike, jog, and enjoy nature. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park, and many use park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. For many of these children, these field trips are among few opportunities to experience nature first hand. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region's quality of life.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>No LRT - I am against the project. They're on the canyon. The Trolley tracks are being used to transport the cars down through Rose Canyon, right? Most people living on both sides of the hillsides are retired and have been living there for years; they've worked all their lives for that property, which they bought for the quietness and serenity of the area. Don't know if project will give them a lot of noise. Their property values are going to spiral down. People aren’t going to want to listen to noise. They’re going to have difficulty selling their homes.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>There is much wildlife in Rose Canyon that's going to be disrupted by the trains.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>The frequency of the trains will be every 7.5 minutes in 2015. So that's another noise factor that's going to be more prevalent.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>There are a number of involved in pulling the project together. Who is going to be paying for these people's salaries? How will salaries continue after the project is completed? I would like to have that info.</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>I take public transit and like coming up here. Concerned with the lack of policing on the trolley and people getting on and off for free. Concerned this will lead to more graffiti in the area. With buses you have to pay, but a lot of people ride trolley without paying. Wherever the trolley goes, there seems to be graffiti. Not a better system if people get on and off without paying, which makes it easier for people to do graffiti. Would hate to see graffiti up here.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>As a former UCSD student, who used to be on campus, and considering that the La Jolla and UCSD areas conduct a lot of research, concerned about safety. Do we want non-affiliated riders to come onto campus easily?</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 3 - Should consider the route that goes east. It is LRT3, which has a terminus at UCSD. This alternative would drop off riders bound for “Westfield UTC” shopping center first, leaving only the people who are really UCSD-bound onboard.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Students would use it, but UCSD is not like SDSU. SDSU is a larger university and people are more spread out, like in the beach areas, which contributes to the ridership. I guess UCSD would benefit having transportation.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>We already have the SuperLoop. There is already some kind of access if you live in the area. And the COASTER goes a little bit further north, to Sorrento Valley. Maybe we could make use of existing services or improve the link between the COASTER and UCSD. Maybe add more stops along the way.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>LRT is good for transit, but concerned about campus safety (accessibility issues). UCSD has bus passes for students and affiliates only; maybe we could have something like that. It would be interesting to have tourists and others around, but I think tourists would be more interested in going to Sea World, SDSU, Qualcomm, etc. versus UCSD. It is a different population of people.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>There is talk about minimizing the disruption to current roads. That is already taken into account, as a lot of the alternatives use existing right-of-ways.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Thinking about the below-grade versus aerial alignment options in the UTC area. How would they look? Would it look like the Trolley Green Line Grantville Station? It is hard for me to image what the trolley would look like in the area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>That's basically it. Safety (accessibility) issues about the type of riders that are coming out to the campus.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support anything that doesn't make me wait, where the place that I have to wait is safe, simple.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Erik Ruehr</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I’m in favor of the project and I support LRT Alt 1.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I would be very, very much against LRT3, which goes right through the middle of Rose Canyon. I have hiked in the canyon and have gone on Audubon Society walks, where different species were pointed out. RC is a very important area. Many endangered species in RC. People have worked for years taking out weeds and invasive species to improve the area, to bring back the endangered species. There groups include Friends of Rose Canyon and the Audubon Society. There areas are disappearing left and right.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>For most of my childhood, I lived across the street from Rose Canyon. We would go see horn toes, snakes, lizards, and birds, many of which lived only in the SD area. That canyon is gone. It is filled in and built on top of. We can’t afford to continue losing these treasures. Many people are working hard to preserve the canyon lands. We can’t afford to lose them.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I would fight tooth and nail against LRT Alt 3, so would many of the people who have been involved and working in these areas.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - Appears LRT Alt 1 avoids most of the problems with environmentally sensitive land species, as it is mostly an aerial alignment. Support transit and LRT, think it is great, but LRT 1 seems to be more mindful of preserving areas in SD that need to be preserved and not having an impact on endangered species and canyon lands.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Pat Herron</td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>If no LRT 1, looks like LRT 6 would be the next most acceptable. But absolutely no LRT 3, we would fight that till our dying breath.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Concerned about an increase in crime, particularly at/near the Nobel Drive Station. If you have a station, there will be more people coming and going, followed by an increase in crime. There are a lot of adjacent residences. Have there been any studies about crime spilling from the trolley stations and into residential neighborhoods? Where someone can jump on the trolley, then get off and steal computers and jewelry from residences near stations? It wouldn’t be hard to look at a police report for areas with trolley stations.</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Concerned with neighborhood impacts caused by the Balboa Avenue Station: specifically, parking. The capacity of this station is estimated to be 250 parking spots. When that gets full, people are going to park on the side streets, including residential streets. This will attract people into the neighborhoods. These people, who may ride the trolley from anywhere south to the border, are going to come into our neighborhoods and steal our stuff, then hop and the trolley and be gone. We won't have a license plate to track them down.</td>
<td>Stations, Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>There doesn’t appear to be an efficient way to get pedestrians from Pacific Beach to the Balboa Ave Station. They have to go through a very dangerous area underneath the I-5 overpass. Also, parking won’t be sufficient to attract people from PB.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Concerned with noise impacts on our neighborhood. Hear that stuff happens in Mission Bay all the time, when there is any kind of amplified music. We already hear the trains at the bottom of the hill, the trolley will add to the noise. Minimize the noise impacts (the hours the trolley operates). Noise will impact our entire neighborhood, located on the southeast corner of Balboa Ave and Morena Blvd.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>We fought viciously against the Balboa Avenue Station some 10 years ago. Now it appears the horses have left the barn. That we’re stuck with it being there and there’s no choice in the matter. We’re vehemently against it. We don't want the Trolley station down there.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>They’re going to need to put up at least a signal down there, because the traffic on Morena Blvd travels at about 50 mph. There’s no way you’re going to be able to have in and out access to a parking lot there without putting on a signal, and that’s just going to slow down our access to the freeways that we enjoy now without having any signal whatsoever to deal with.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>You're not going to get any ridership from our neighborhood. We’d have to walk down the hill and hike back up 230 feet above sea level to get to our houses, so nobody in our neighborhood is a going to walk down there and walk back up. There is no multifamily housing anywhere near that. And I really doubt that the ridership will attract people from Pacific Beach. They've got buses already. As far as I’m concerned, the buses are working fine.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>I think a lot of the assumptions that the projects are based on are simply wrong. Regarding ridership, I've been told that they need 20,000 trips a day to make this viable. Anytime I've ridden the Trolley or the bus, the ridership is grossly less than what people expect it to be and the individuals that are riding them are rather shady characters that you don't want to be riding them. I wouldn't want my wife or daughter or anybody else to be riding the bus or Trolley.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>I was told that the individuals that are going to be riding the Trolley are going to be of a higher caliber, like if they're coming from UCSD. But some individuals accessing our neighborhoods via the Trolley may steal things, hopping on the Trolley as a getaway, which is going to attract crime to our neighborhoods. They wanted to put a Detox Center on the other side of the freeway, but everyone objected to it. The Trolley is going to attract the same sort of element. We already have a transient population living down there, in and around the bridges and near the proposed Trolley. The 250 cars that are going to be parked during the day are going to attract more crime to the area. The parking lots are euphemistically known as &quot;park and steals&quot; because they know that stolen cars won't be reported until later on in the evening, so they have all day to ride around in a stolen car. Once they steal cars from the parking lot, an element of crime will be attracted into our neighborhood - they'll start burglarizing our homes and cars. And we've got a nice neighborhood, and now it's just going to attract a criminal element that we've never seen before.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I think LRT Alt 1 would be the best option.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>We’re not looking to the future with this system. We’re ending it like this. So you want to go up to Sorrento Valley eventually? Well, don’t do this segment coming back this way - go directly to Sorrento Valley. Use two trains, an A and B Train. One train will go this way (indicating) and one train will go up Sorrento Valley. This train will go to the new Miramar Airport someday. The Marines will no longer need to conduct their touch-and-go practice over the dump anymore and all their planes will be vertical takeoff soon. This means that Miramar can be built onto, making it a commercial airport. The Marines will just need a hanger for their tankers and their troop transport planes. Aim towards Miramar. Supposed to go up to Mira Mesa eventually, right? I mean, another 30 years, this is 10 years behind schedule now.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Schedule, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>Think of putting a stop at Jutland Drive.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>This rail line seems to have no capture point for getting people from 1-5 “that are traveling southbound to” the UTC/UCSD area to access the Trolley. Give them a place to park so they can get onto the Trolley and make the rest of the ride downtown. A Trolley stop with the big parking structure around the area of 1-5 and Genesee would be an ideal place to capture the people, although it would require re-routing a little further north.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>With regard to the Balboa Drive Station, there’s a need for some way to get the buses from that station across to Grand Avenue, flying across the Santa Fe tracks, 1-5, and East Mission Bay Drive, so that all of those structures don’t block the process. If you take a bus from the station and try to get through the Garnet Ave traffic structure, it's probably going to add 5-minutes, which may be enough to push people into driving their personal vehicles the whole way, rather than taking public transit.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting Verbal</td>
<td>A station at Genesee Ave and I-5 would provide a very short shuttle ride for the COASTER shuttle (from the COASTER Sorrento Valley Station to this station), making it more likely for people to transfer from the COASTER, to the shuttle, to the Trolley, to the various places in the UCSD and UTC area.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>LRT Alt 6 is not preferable because it misses the station on Nobel Drive</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>and I-5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Think that there's a need for a COASTER station somewhere in UTC.</td>
<td>General comment, Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>And I think this can be done much quicker than, you know, finishing the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whole Mid-Coast Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>If eventually a connection to the airport, want to ensure that, within</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>the Mid-Coast Corridor, there will be a stop at OTTC with service provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to at least Santa Fe Depot, so that there will be a downtown to airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>connection. I think it's a great idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2010</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Support Project - We've lived in different places in the UTC area.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Regardless of where we live, think it's going to be a great thing. Most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people in the UTC area feel cut out from the rest of the city. We have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the time and the resources but we still don't go downtown more than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>once a month. And it's mainly because it's a pain to drive and find a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parking space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Sam Burroughs</td>
<td>5/5/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I would like to see the following information made available:</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial statements for the current trolley operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capital investment to lay the new proposed lines, purchase additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equipment and extend existing operations (new hires, etc.), plus ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operational cost estimates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Study results, and who conducted the study, on the impact of additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trolley lines and operations to the affected areas-- eminent domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acquisitions, automobile / pedestrian traffic disruptions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ridership estimates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Objective pros and cons analysis of this proposed expansion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to any public meetings, this and any other pertinent information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>should be made available to the public in an advertised, easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accessible location, for example the <a href="http://www.sdmts.com/Trolley">http://www.sdmts.com/Trolley</a> web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Matthew Stucky</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The problem I see with this plan is its almost complete circumvention of any residential areas. Nobody lives next to I-5. I currently live in PB and work downtown. I would love to be able to take the Trolley to work but this plan places the station on the eastern side of I-5, which wouldn't be convenient at all. It is also at the bottom of a huge hill such that Clairemont residents would likewise not benefit from the station. This plan seems to connect UCSD and University City with downtown while avoiding everything in between.</td>
<td>Stations, Purpose and need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Matthew Stucky</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The alternative, although admittedly more radical, plan that I suggest: from Old Town, run &quot;LRT&quot; out Sports Arena Blvd. to Ingraham St. Continue on Ingraham St. to Garnet and turn east. Placing a station at Ingraham and Garnet would place public transit without walking distance to almost the entire population of PB. Continue on Garnet and up Balboa Ave to Genesee. Then turn north on Genesee and continue into University City as planned. Envision stations at Sports Arena, Sea World, Ingraham and Garnet, Balboa and I-5, Balboa and Clairemont, Balboa and Genesee, Clairemont Mesa and Genesee, and then the currently planned stations. Such a route would place tens of thousands of people within walking distance of a transit line. Sea World and the Sports Arena would be accessible. Students in PB could travel to both UCSD and SDSU without driving. Residents of PB and Clairemont could commute to University City and downtown. I can honestly say that with such a line, I could travel 90% of the time without using a car. I would be connected to work downtown and shopping in Sports Arena, Mission Valley, and UTC. Such a plan could also serve to revitalize Clairemont if higher density development was included along the transit corridor. This plan would revolutionize the entire area. Of course, it would cost more and disrupt areas since easy transit corridors do not exist. Ideally, it seems an elevated line could work. I would imagine that such a line would drastically reduce traffic such that the loss of a traffic lane, if necessary, would not disrupt traffic flow. Please consider this plan: it's admittedly not as easy, it would definitely cost more, but it would actually be useful to residents. If we're going to spend the money, let's do it in a way that makes this area of SD truly public-transit-friendly. Such a route would drastically change this area of SD for the better.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Stations, Alignments, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Cynthia Jenson-Elliott</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT - I am a northwest Clairemont resident, and I am delighted to see that the Trolley will be extended to Clairemont and La Jolla.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Cynthia Jenson-Elliott</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes Direct Routes to UCSD - I do not support sending the trolley through our favorite green belt, Rose Canyon. A more direct route straight up to UCSD is far preferable, due to the environmental impacts of the trolley and the greater simplicity of having the trolley go straight where you want it to go</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Cynthia Jenson-Elliott</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I would like to see my own neighborhood served. I notice that the trolley would completely skip a stop in North Clairemont, with stops only at Balboa and Clairemont Drive. For the trolley to be truly useful, it should also stop at the end of Jutland, thus serving the North Clairemont areas as well as the south.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Cynthia Jenson-Elliott</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I hope you will consider sending the trolley straight up I-5, instead of detouring through Rose Canyon, and will consider adding a stop at the end of Jutland Drive, serving the community of North Clairemont.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Walter Brewer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Abandon all efforts pertaining to LRT options. With national, state, and personal finances under severe stress, we simply cannot afford priority to nearly $1.2 billion for an 11 mile route resulting in riders saving 2 to 4 minutes average travel time, compared to much less expensive improved bus options. The claimed weekday travel of 351,000 passenger-miles is 50% more than the 19 mile trolley Blue Line achieves with its unique Mexican Border demographics. Projected population and jobs increase in the Mid Coast corridor are only 20% and 14% respectively. It is unrealistic to believe more than half of new riders will be those who have shifted from automobiles when each would suffer about 12 minutes travel time loss and two transfers.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Walter Brewer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Institute instead pragmatic incremental improvement in existing bus facilities at about 5% of the LRT option cost. Prioritize better service for the core non-driver riders. The bus example shown in draft Mid Coast analysis reports, at 5% the cost, produces over 80% the passenger-miles generated by the vastly more expensive LRT options. Planned expansion of I-5, including HOV lanes designed at considerable expense for bus use, will make bus travel time competitive, require less land, and provide more destination and station flexibility. About a 30% efficiency improvement can be expected in bus energy use. Small buses during off peak demand can conserve more.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Walter Brewer</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>It would help public understanding for this and other projects if the principal options, rail, bus, and highway, could be compared and presented in the same context of cost, utilization, energy, emissions, land use etc.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Laurence Michael</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has regulatory and safety oversight over railroad crossings in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires CPUC approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the CPUC with exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>California PUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Laurence Michael</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>In the development of the environmental document, SANDAG should analyze impacts to highway-rail crossings. CPUC approval is required for the construction of any new crossing. SANDAG should consider grade separations for major thoroughfares and study pedestrian and vehicle traffic at the crossings. During the process, SANDAG should be in contact with staff to discuss any relevant concerns or issues.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td>California PUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Joseph Steinbach</td>
<td>5/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>As it will be very crowded where the tracks go under SR 52, maintain the following: the wildlife corridor that goes all the way to Mission Bay; bicycle and pedestrian paths; storm water conveyance; and, vehicular access to maintain sewers, fiber-optic cable, and other utilities. Take advantage of MWWD's low impact vehicles. Do not underground the creek. Keep stormwater and wild life path.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Julie Medlock</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I believe that the Trolley would best be routed along I-805, from Mission Valley to Noble Drive, and then west to UCSD.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Julie Medlock</td>
<td>6/2/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon are ecological treasures. The plants and animals in these “greenbelts” need to be protected, &quot;No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee.&quot; In addition, migratory birds use the Marion Bear/San Clemente Canyon area and Rose Canyon area twice every year. Thank you for protecting Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Stephen Keane</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I would like you to know that I believe any further effort to build this completely destructive bridge in the University City neighborhood is foolhardy. Please continue to focus your attentions on more pressing matters of the city - like balancing the budget, water supply issues, and education! I pay the city property taxes that exceed $20,000 per year as well as taxes for the business that I run and hope that, as a concerned taxpayer, you at least get the opportunity to read this note and understand how development of an unnecessary bridge would ruin one of the coolest communities in the city. Quality of life of a community that was built in 1963 is important to be preserved and 17,000 cars racing through it would certainly ruin that quality of life. Thank you all for your understanding and please continue to represent taxpayers - not builders who come and go and do not have to live where they build!</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Nancy McLaughlin</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Can SANDAG mail a colored snapshot of the LRT Alt 1 crossing over I-5, from the video presentation of the alternatives (located at <a href="http://www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast">www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast</a> <a href="http://www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast">http://www.SANDAG.org/MidCoast</a>)?</td>
<td>Requests for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 618        | Nancy McLaughlin       | 5/28/2010  | Phone             | How long will scoping comments be received? Consider the following:  
  1. Revise the project map, on the project Web site, to clarify that LRT Alt 1 is not located on the west side of I-5 until near La Jolla Village Square.  
  2. For presentations to community groups, include the video presentation of the alternatives. Revise the video by: 1) slowing down the speed and 2) including a narrative detailing the proximity of the alignment to the freeway right-of-way, structures, etc.  
  Interested in planning infrastructure improvements before the selection of a transit alternative for the project. | Requests for information, Public involvement |                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Dennis Doyle</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Today’s SD Union-Tribune featured Rose Canyon and the beautiful trails that run through this gorgeous, pristine area, recommending it as a hiking destination for the citizens of SD. We have so little open space in our city. Indeed, Rose Canyon serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife in the region. I have observed hawks, fox, owls, bobcats, raccoons and other amazing critters in this wildlife corridor. The city has committed to the conservation of Rose Canyon and to protecting its bio-diversity and the region’s quality of life. When I walk, run, or bike through the canyon I sometimes forget that I am in a large urban city. It is the one place nearby that I can escape to while reconnecting with nature.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Dennis Doyle</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The proposed trolley route through Rose Canyon to Genesee (LRT 3), however, would devastate Rose Canyon OS Park, bringing with it additional ambient noise, visual pollution and significant environmental impacts: new tracks, poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and the disruption of frequent trolleys passing through the canyon. I urge you, therefore, to please delete the proposed (LRT 3) routing of the trolley to an alternative route that would not impact Rose Canyon. 4,500 students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of Rose Canyon, and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature. My 15-year old twins have participated in these field trips and they have had wonderful experiences with nature first hand. For the sake of future generations, please delete LRT 3 from the trolley options.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Bill Crane</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alt 1 and 6 - Request that any trolley extension route continue north along I-5 to UCSD and NOT through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Jeff Flowers</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Please remember that San Diego is very deficient in providing open space parks for its citizens. As with Balboa Park in San Diego (or Central Park in New York), these open space resources will increase in value in the future. Once these open spaces have been developed, they cannot be replaced.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Jeff Flowers</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please consider alternative route for the trolley, &quot;No trolley through Rose Canyon Park&quot;!</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Ken Young</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please preserve the natural beauty of not only Rose Canyon, but all canyons in SD County. If you grew up here, you understand the part they play in our county's natural beauty and what they hold for our children's future. &quot;No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee.&quot;</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>John Wolfe</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - &quot;No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee.&quot;</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Adelle Owen</td>
<td>5/30/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please, no trolley or any other construction for travel or transportation through Rose Canyon. It is a San Diego sanctuary that we need for a balanced life and quiet time to enjoy wildlife and the natural surroundings.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Carol Crafts</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - A trolley in Rose Canyon? No Way. San Diego County has already lost too much open space and builders just don't seem to get it. More houses means more traffic and less of the quality of life that makes San Diego desirable. Don't take away more open space from the humans and wildlife that live here.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Joan Christiansen</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please do not allow the spoiling of Rose Canyon, our precious heritage. We, our children, and our grandchildren deserve to keep this bit of nature in the midst of sprawling development. &quot;No trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee.&quot;</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Dick Larsen</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes I-5 Alts - Please do not consider routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. The I-5 route would serve UCSD better, probably cost less, and spare one of SD's last natural treasures.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Costs, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Yvonne Dows</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - No trolley through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Lauren Underwood</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Strongly oppose the possibility of having the trolley run through any part of Rose Canyon. I would like to request that you delete this route from any further consideration. Please look into alternate routes that won’t impose any environmental threats to the little bit that we have preserved. This route will “impact” Rose Canyon Park in many ways. This is a place where families &amp; children can enjoy the natural beauty, natural wildlife, where we can picnic, hike, bike, field trips, scouting adventure, and much more. Being a resident for over 30 years and watching the urban development grow and grow, I have witnessed a huge loss of natural habitats which I would like to preserve this area as a long and lasting natural park so that future generations can see and enjoy what this regions quality of life really is.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Barbara Zirino</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The choice of routing a loud and obtrusive trolley and its' multiple encumberments through Rose Canyon would be a serious mistake in judgment. It would permanently damage the careful efforts of many in the community to save a piece of our natural setting. An uninspired answer is to just go ahead and homogenize this community and its canyon full of character to the same growth solutions used for much of Southern California, the result of which is the inability to recognize one place from another, as they are all the same. The guiding value of accommodating future growth should not be the only value in which to make this decision. We have a chance to save this special and lovely spot but it will take wisdom and vision.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Barbara Zirino</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - Please run it along the already developed section going to UCSD (LRT1).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Nancy Appel</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I oppose the trolley through Rose Canyon. Please preserve Rose Canyon as open space. I enjoy bird watching, biking, and hiking in Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Stephanie Webber</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am writing to register my strong opposition to the idea of running the trolley through Rose Canyon (LRT 3).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Stephanie Webber</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - I urge you to select LRT 1 that continues along I-5 to UCSD, even though this route will lead to adverse effects on the canyon at its western end.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Stephanie Webber</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Running the LRT system right through the canyon, as in the LRT 3 concept, will be infinitely more damaging and will devastate Rose Canyon Open Space Park. We have so few open spaces left within our city and I urge you to be responsible in working to conserve it. The park enhances the quality of life for many of us. It is beautiful and full of wildlife.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>David Krysl</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I'm adamantly opposed to LRT 3, which goes through Rose Canyon needlessly. I wish that the project has as little impact on the canyon as possible.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>John Nowell</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - My family and I strongly oppose the trolley route through Rose Canyon.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Christianne Knoop</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please find an alternative route for the trolley. It does not belong in Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is a special place that should be nurtured and preserved, as it is not only host to many different animal species, that depend on it's undisturbed existence, it is also a beautiful place for humans to enjoy as well. We have so few of these relatively untouched areas, we must protect the ones we have.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Gary Keller</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - We strongly oppose a trolley routed through Rose Canyon. We have been residents of University City since 1968. Our children, and now our grandchildren, have enjoyed using the trails in this park for hiking as well as biking. We have enjoyed the natural look and peacefulness of this area. There are so many wonderful plants and animals that use this canyon for their home. Where would they go? I'm certain that they would not be welcomed on the trolley to find another location. Please consider all of the children from the surrounding schools that, over the years, have enjoyed the advantage of having this wonderful area to help them learn about wildlife. There are so few places left in residential areas that have this distinction. Please save ours!</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Les Kacev</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - We oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon and request that this option be dropped.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>Les Kacev</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes I-5 Alts - The alternative routes through the I-5 corridor, “LRT Alts 1 and 6,” will have less damaging environmental impacts “to Rose Canyon.”</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>Ariane Jansma</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alt 1 - Strong opposition to routing the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). Ask that you remove this route from any further consideration in the environmental study and instead focus efforts on LRT 1. The LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD would be very useful for the community and would not have near the devastating impact on Rose Canyon OS Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>Ariane Jansma</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - The LRT 3 route would destroy Rose Canyon OS Park, with ridiculous noise and environmental impacts from new tracks, poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. Our community values Rose Canyon OS Park as a fantastic resource in terms of education for our local schools and through our own use via hiking, biking, jogging, etc. My family and I hike this canyon regularly and, as a community, we believe it needs to be protected.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>Ariane Jansma</td>
<td>6/3/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - LRT 1 route is a good solution for the trolley and minimizes the extreme environmental impact the other route, &quot;LRT Alt 3,&quot; would cause.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Camille</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Significant ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS through Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve!!!! These impacts cannot be mitigated. 1.) Diverse habitats &amp; wildlife will be impacted: This incredible park, with healthy and diverse threatened habitats of coastal sage scrub, chaparral, and oak/sycamore woodland riparian, is home to a huge diversity of wildlife (i.e., 99 species of birds). Having a trolley go through this increasingly valuable resource is NOT A COMPATIBLE land use. 2.) Noise pollution will impact the wildlife and human life. 3.) The visual impact of the poles, overhead wires, and big retaining walls will destroy the aesthetics of the natural view and beauty.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Camille</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Experience in Rose Canyon Open Space preserve: As an environmental education teacher, I have led 15 science standard field trips for elementary school students. I administer the SD Audubon after school program called OutdoorExplore! (We lead students on four 1.5 hr hikes each Fall &amp; Spring season, from 2007 to present). Our SD Children &amp; Nature Collaborative is working with Friends of Rose Canyon to help more families go hiking and to help more schools do Nearby Nature School Field Trips, through the countywide schools guidebook.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Kathleen Geckeler</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT, No LRT Alt 3 - Encourage SANDAG to support plans for the trolley that DO NOT go through Rose Canyon. I’m a native San Diegan and value our canyons as one of city’s greatest assets. Growing up in Kensington, I have long opposed building and other construction that jeopardizes this resource. The damage to Rose Canyon would be far reaching, forever damaging its beauty and potential as a true place left to &quot;getaway&quot; and enjoy nature within city limits. We live in University City and frequent Rose Canyon almost daily. Please route the trolley along existing freeways or other areas where environmental damage will be less or to areas already impacted.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Jon Eisen</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I know that if you build it, they will come…and more &amp; more will come. And traffic will not be relieved for any lengthy time frame, as more quiet, family neighborhoods will be upset and turn into rentals as all but the most stubborn homeowners will move as the noise and traffic disrupts their lives.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>Jon Eisen</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>In Phoenix, before we left for SD, they were in process of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to widen interstate highways and streets, condemning properties where families had lived for decades so that Indian Casinos and strip malls could take over the space. How did that improve quality of life? It didn’t, unless your lobbyist was successful in taking privately owned land and garnering federally subsidized monies. It’s an endless cycle of Big Business Interests that care not a wit about the people in their way of more profits. There are enough reasons to move from the financially bankrupt City of SD, and this may be the final nail in the coffin pushing my family (and others) to move to a nearby city that is managed with the general populace in mind, and not just the developers that have an outsized influence on decision making that effects thousands of other citizens.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Jon Eisen</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes I-5 Alts - Please re-consider routing the trolley through undeveloped Rose Canyon and established neighborhoods. Instead, route it along an existing roadway, like I-5.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>Daly Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes I-5 Alts - The route through Rose Canyon is the most destructive of all the proposed alternatives. Please find a route that does not require building tracks and poles and overhead wires through this natural park. Obviously, there is no solution that is completely free of undesirable consequences, but the Rose Canyon solution is the most destructive and disruptive of all the alternatives. I-5 has already disrupted a great deal of that land, and so a bit more is less of a shock to the environment than the other alternatives.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Daly Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The stops available will be more useful to more of the population, as far as I can see.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Daly Jessup</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - Please take Rose Canyon off the list of alternatives. San Diego is, bit by bit, losing its areas of beauty. Please don’t add another victim to the list.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>Virginia Gainer</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support LRT Alt 1 - I am in support of LRT 1 for the proposed trolley. It is the much more functional and environmentally sound route.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>Virginia Gainer</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose LRT 3 through Rose Canyon. It would devastate one of our few open spaces enjoyed by families all over San Diego. We must protect this treasure.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>James Steger</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Favor either LRT Alt 1 or 6.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>James Steger</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - LRT Alt 3 through Rose Canyon along the railroad tracks should be avoided. I’ve lived in University City for 30 years and have watched the slow encroachments on this park and on its wildlife. As much as I love the rumble of the freight trains and Coaster, adding another set of tracks with overhead wires for the trolley through Rose Canyon will further diminish our open space and wildlife preserve. Since there are no proposed stops in Rose Canyon, i.e., at Regents Road, there is essentially no benefit to the residents on either side of Rose Canyon—just more traffic through a widened rail corridor. We have lost the once ubiquitous and striking jack rabbits, the howling of coyotes, and the surprise seeing of red and grey foxes from the encroachment of all the houses and condominiums building along the north rim of Rose Canyon over the past 20 years. Surely routing the trolleys along LRT Alt 3 through Rose Canyon will only exacerbate this wildlife flight from the area.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>James Steger</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alts 1 and 6 - LRT Alts 1 and 6 would serve the same purpose as LRT Alt 3, in terms of main transit stops, with the main Transit Center at UTC, and have none of the additional visual, noise, and space encroachment in Rose Canyon that drive our wildlife out of the area. I heartily support these other two routes and encourage our county officials and city councilmembers to support either of these two alternatives to the Rose Canyon routing of the trolley &quot;LRT Alt 3&quot;.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>Laura Kligman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am writing to you to express my most strident opposition to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon. This proposed route would devastate Rose Canyon, one of the few remaining nature preserves we have in SD. More specifically, this proposed route would severely (and negatively) impact the quality of life that my family and I enjoy in a neighborhood that abuts Rose Canyon. The noise and pollution associated with this train would be unbearable. We would no longer be able to take our children and dog into or near the canyon. Simply sitting in our own backyard and enjoying the peace and solitude that we are currently afforded would no longer be possible. I implore you to no longer consider LRT 3 as a viable option for the trolley and to pursue other, less destructive options.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>Emmi Olson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT, No LRT Alt 3 - I strongly oppose the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I urge you to delete this route from any further consideration in the environmental study. My husband and I have walked in this canyon nearly every week since arriving in SD 9 years ago. We take our friends from out of town there to show them the beautiful environment we call home. The park is a well utilized community resource. Every time we go, we see at least 5-10 other people out jogging, walking their dogs, and enjoying the sunshine. Although I'm strongly in favor of mass transportation and very much would like to see the Trolley come to UCSD, there must be an alt route that would not threaten one of the few natural canyons and wildlife refuges SD has left.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>Emmi Olson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - The proposed LRT-1 route would not threaten Rose Canyon, one of the few natural canyons and wildlife refuges SD has left. Additionally, as a UCSD student who would consider living further from campus and taking the Trolley to school daily, I would much prefer a more direct route that came straight from downtown to campus, without detouring around Rose Canyon to UTC and then to campus.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>Emmi Olson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alt 1 - I do not know how the city would find space on UCSD to house an end Trolley stop “for LRT Alt 3, the UCSD West Station,” without taking away more parking lots. Seeing as how there is already such limited parking at UCSD, this would pose a real problem for commuters who are not on the Trolley line or professional students who are forced to drive due to the odd hours they are expected in hospitals (neither the shuttle nor the Trolley to my knowledge run at 4:00 AM!). In contrast, I have lived in this area for years and have never seen the UTC mall have a parking problem, “as this would be the terminus station for LRT Alt 1.”</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>Emmi Olson</td>
<td>5/27/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - San Diego has so few beautiful places to walk and enjoy the coastal desert. Please protect the ones that we do have by choosing a more practical route for the Trolley expansion.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>David Gottfredson</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, Yes LRT Alt 1 - My husband and I would like to add our names to the list of those opposed to routing the trolley through Rose Canyon. We are looking forward to finally having the trolley in our neighborhood because we believe that good, accessible public transportation is very important. We realize that no matter what route is chosen there will be environmental impacts to be endured. We believe that LRT 1 route is the best alternative and would benefit more businesses to the north and east of UCSD. We love hiking in Rose and San Clemente Canyons and hate to see any more devastation than necessary.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Daniel Beeman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I am opposed to the routing of the trolley through Rose Canyon to Genesee Avenue (LRT 3). I beg you to please delete this route from any further consideration.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>Daniel Beeman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yes LRT Alt 1 - Please select as the preferred trolley alternative the LRT 1 route that continues north along I-5 to UCSD. I understand this route will have significant environmental impacts at the west end of Rose Canyon OS Park and Marion Bear Memorial Park, but I’m willing to compromise if we get Rose Creek required mitigation.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Daniel Beeman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - LRT 3 through Rose Canyon to Genesee will devastate Rose Canyon, with more noise, visual, and environmental impacts: new tracks, added poles, wires, grading, retaining walls, and frequent trolleys. I and people from all over SD and the nation (as an avid hiker I know this!) use this park to hike (see Google search - Hiking San Diego), bike, jog, and enjoy nature. Thousands of students from across SD attend the 4 schools within walking distance of the park and many use the park for field trips to explore and learn about nature, as has my own local hiking club: Walks with God (Horizon Singles Ministry), utilizing both Marian Bear and Rose Canyon. For many children, these field trips are among the few opportunities they have to experience nature first hand. We’ve even brought single parent children along to see nature and birds of prey exhibits/talks. Rose Canyon also serves as an important natural preserve for plants and wildlife and a wildlife corridor. The city has committed to its conservation to protect biodiversity and the region’s quality of life. Recently we’ve had lots of beautiful color and this is an entry way to getting new hikers from walking to hiking in nature easily.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Daniel Beeman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>As a 3 year trolley count employee, I have seen that lines, like the Trolley Green Line, have little effective ridership vs. costs and natural damage. Only two of the trips on the trolley to SDSU are full or even highly busy. Most riders are from Grossmont and Old transit stations (workers), and many just one stop away Alvarado (45%) park-n-ride. Check the trolley counts.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>Daniel Beeman</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Better to create a &quot;LRT&quot; loop that can provide more transportation in a circle: Old Town to UCSD, with a spur to UTC, then to I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium (via Carroll Canyon Road/Fenton Rd to I-15). Complete the loop now while possible. Before too developed!!!</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>Karen Goebel</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The primary concern and mandate of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is the protection of public fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. The USFWS has legal responsibility for the welfare of migratory birds, anadromous fish, and endangered animals and plants occurring in the U.S. The USFWS is also responsible for administering the Federal Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>Karen Goebel</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Several sensitive habitats exist within the project area including coastal sage scrub, wetlands, salt marsh, chaparral, and grassland. The project also falls under the City of San Diego (City) Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (SAP).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>Karen Goebel</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The USFWS is concerned about the potential cumulative impacts from the project and other transportation projects, including the proposed I-5 North Coast Widening Project and the California High Speed Rail Project. The SEIS/SEIR should include discussions on other proposed projects within the Mid-Coast Corridor and address any cumulative impacts that may occur.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 676        | Karen Goebel      | 6/1/2010   | Letter            | To enable us to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish, and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the SEIS/SEIR:  

1. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.  
2. A complete list and assessment of the flora and fauna within, and adjacent to, the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying State- or Federally-listed rare, threatened, endangered, or proposed candidate species, California Species-of-Special Concern and/or State Protected or Fully Protected species, and any locally unique species and sensitive habitats. Specifically, the DEIR should include: a.) A thorough assessment of Rare Natural Communities on site and within the area of impact. We recommend following the California Department of Fish and Game’s Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities; b.) A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of impact; c.) An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered species on site and within the area of impact; and, d.) Discussions regarding seasonal variations in use by sensitive species of the project site as well as the area of impact on those species, using acceptable species-specific survey procedures as determined through consultation with the Wildlife Agencies. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted in conformance with established protocols at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. | Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need | USFWS       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources. All facets of the project should be included in this assessment. Specifically, the DEIR should provide: a.) Specific acreage and descriptions of the types of wetlands, coastal sage scrub, and other sensitive habitats that will or may be affected by the proposed project or project alternatives. Maps and tables should be used to summarize such information; b.) Discussions regarding the regional setting, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(a), with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region that would be affected by the project. This discussion is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts; c.) Detailed discussions, including both qualitative and quantitative analyses, of the potentially affected listed and sensitive species (fish, wildlife, plants), and their habitats on the proposed project site, area of impact, and alternative sites, including information pertaining to their local status and distribution. The anticipated or real impacts of the project on these species and habitats should be fully addressed; d.) Discussions regarding indirect project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed NCCP reserve lands. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address: i.) project-related changes on drainage patterns on and downstream of the project site; ii.) the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; iii.) polluted runoff; iv.) soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and, v.) post-project fate of runoff from the project site; e.) Discussions regarding possible conflicts resulting from wildlife-human interactions at the interface between the development project and natural habitats. The zoning of areas for development projects or other uses that are nearby or adjacent to natural areas may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions; f.) An analysis of cumulative effects, as described under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, and past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed concerning their impacts on similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plant communities and wildlife habitats; and, g.) An analysis of the effect that the project may have on implementation of the MSCP and the City's SAP. We recommend that the Lead Agency ensure that the development of this and other proposed projects do not preclude long-term preserve planning options and that projects are consistent with the requirements of the MSCP and City SAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Mitigation measures for unavoidable adverse project-related impacts on sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance, and where avoidance is infeasible, reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, offsite mitigation through acquisition and preservation in perpetuity of the affected habitats should be addressed. We generally do not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts on rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This discussion should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values where preservation and/or restoration is proposed. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc. Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: a.) the location of the mitigation site; b.) the plant species to be used; c.) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; d.) time of year that planting will occur; e.) a description of the irrigation methodology; f.) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; g.) success criteria; h.) a detailed monitoring program; i.) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and, j.) identification of the entity(ies) that will guarantee achieving the success criteria and provide for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation measures to alleviate indirect project impacts on biological resources must be included, including measures to minimize changes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
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<td>Comment</td>
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<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>the hydrologic regimes on site, and means to convey runoff without damaging biological resources, including the morphology of on-site and downstream habitats. 5. As discussed previously, descriptions and analyses of a range of alternatives to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated. The analyses must include alternatives that avoid or otherwise reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas of lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The following statements and comments have been prepared pursuant to the California Department of Fish and Game’s (CDFG’s) authority as Trustee Agency with jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project (CEQA Guidelines §15386) and pursuant to our authority as a Responsible Agency under CEQA Guidelines Section 15381 over those aspects of the proposed project that come under the purview of the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code§Al50 et seq.) and Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. The CDFG also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The project is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan (and Implementing Agreements under the NCCP program) for the City of San Diego. The NCCP process addresses only those projects that would implement the provisions of the plans through approval by the participating local jurisdictions. The MSCP is intended to provide for the conservation of interconnected habitats that will support the covered species in the long-term. The provisions of the MSCP Subarea Plans were designed to work synergistically toward realization of this goal and must be implemented as designed to achieve this. Although there is some flexibility in the plan, actions clearly contrary to it, may severely limit success to local and regional conservation goals. Because of this, the cooperation of agencies such as the FTA and SANDAG, whom are not covered by the MSCP, would be beneficial. Demonstrating consistency of the proposed project in terms of ensuring that all requirements and conditions of the respective Subarea Plans are met needs to be considered during the environmental review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives Report mentions that there will be an evaluation for consistency of the project with the USCD 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The LRDP for UCSD identifies designated campus natural resources consisting of canyon, steep slopes, native vegetation, and eucalyptus groves as &quot;Park.&quot; The LRDP cites that the Park consists of three types of natural reserves that have different constraints to development: Ecological Reserve (which includes the area south of Genesee Avenue, the canyons on the East Campus), Restoration Lands (targeted for restoration or enhancement as mitigation for campus project impacts) and Grove. The Draft SEIS/SEIR should analyze/evaluate the alternative route alignments in regards to potential impacts of previously conserved lands under the LRDP and identify the necessary avoidance and minimization measures for these designated areas (including commensurate mitigation for direct habitat and species-related impacts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>One of the purposes of CEQA is to &quot;prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible&quot; (CEQA Guideline, §15002(a)(3); emphasis added). Because of the potential for projects to occur within environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area) the CEQA alternatives analysis for this project is extremely important. The CDFG is particularly interested in the Draft SEIS/SEIR describing a &quot;range of reasonable alternatives to the project (particularly options to minimize grading impacts to preserve lands), or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives,&quot; as required by Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guideline. The alternatives are to include an &quot;alternative [that] would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly&quot; (§15126.6[b] of the CEQA Guidelines). The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making (§15126.6[f] of the CEQA Guidelines). The CDFG will consider the alternatives analyzed in the context of their relative impacts on biological resources on both a local and regional level. Furthermore, for the CDFG to utilize the CEQA document as a Responsible Agency, the alternatives must include those which avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources that are regulated by the Fish and Game Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Take authorization pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and the Federal Endangered Species Act must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in &quot;take&quot; of state and/or federally listed species of plants or animals (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo), either during construction or over the life of the project. Permits authorizing take are issued to conserve, protect, enhance, and restore listed threatened or endangered species and their habitats. Early consultation is encouraged with the CDFG (or when applicable the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), as significant modification to a project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain take authorization. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that the CDFG issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of a CESA permit unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of CESA. In the event take authorization is required for the proposed project the following items would be required:&lt;br&gt; a) Biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA permit.&lt;br&gt; b) CDFG-approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Protection Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>All construction and post-construction best management practices (BMPs) should be located within the development footprint (i.e., included in the impact analysis as loss of habitat). The draft SEIS/SEIR should include a figure depicting the location of BMPs in relation the development footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Native plants should be used to the greatest extent feasible in landscaped areas adjacent to and/or near mitigation/open space areas and/or wetland/riparian areas. The applicant should not plant, seed, or otherwise introduce invasive exotic plant species to landscaped areas adjacent and/or near native habitat areas. Exotic plant species not to be used include those species listed on the California Invasive Plant Council's (Cal-IPC) Invasive Plant Inventory. This list includes such species as: pepper trees, pampas grass, fountain grass, ice plant, myoporum, black locust, capeweed, tree of heaven, periwinkle, sweet alyssum, English ivy, French broom, Scotch broom, and Spanish broom. In addition, landscaping adjacent to native habitat areas should not use plants that require intensive irrigation, fertilizers, or pesticides. Water runoff from landscaped areas should be directed away from mitigation/open space areas and contained and/or treated within the development footprint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 684        | Edmund Pert       | 5/28/2010 | Letter           | The CDFG has responsibility for wetland and riparian habitats. It is the policy of the CDFG to strongly discourage development in wetlands or conversion of wetlands to uplands. We oppose any development or conversion which would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values, unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be "no net loss" of either wetland habitat values or acreage. Development and conversion include but are not limited to conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether intermittent or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. Mitigation measures to compensate for impacts to mature riparian corridors must be included in the Draft EIR and must compensate for the loss of function and value of a wildlife corridor.  

a) The project area supports aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats; therefore, a jurisdictional delineation of the creeks and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the Draft EIR. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the Service's wetland definition adopted by the CDFG. Please note that some wetland and riparian habitats subject to the CDFG's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. | Environmental impacts    | CDFG         |
<table>
<thead>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) The CDFG also has regulatory authority with regard to activities occurring in streams and/or lakes that could adversely affect any fish or wildlife resource. For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, the project applicant (or &quot;entity&quot;) must provide written notification to the CDFG pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, the CDFG then determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. The CDFG's issuance of a LSA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by the CDFG as a responsible agency. The CDFG as a responsible agency under CEQA may consider the local jurisdiction's (lead agency) Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the CDFG pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>To enable the CDFG to adequately review and comment on the proposed project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) The CDFG also has regulatory authority with regard to activities occurring in streams and/or lakes that could adversely affect any fish or wildlife resource. For any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of a river or stream, or use material from a streambed, the project applicant (or &quot;entity&quot;) must provide written notification to the CDFG pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, the CDFG then determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement is required. The CDFG's issuance of a LSA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by the CDFG as a responsible agency. The CDFG as a responsible agency under CEQA may consider the local jurisdiction's (lead agency) Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report for the project. To minimize additional requirements by the CDFG pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. and/or under CEQA, the document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) The document should contain a complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) A range of feasible alternatives should be included to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated; the alternatives should avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be evaluated in areas with lower resource sensitivity where appropriate.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Purpose and need</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 686        | Edmund Pert       | 5/28/2010  | Letter            | The document should provide a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, sensitive, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. This should include a complete floral and faunal species compendium of the entire project site, undertaken at the appropriate time of year. The draft SEIS/SEIR should include the following information.  

a) CEQA Guidelines, Section 15125(c), direct that knowledge of the regional setting is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, and that special emphasis should be placed on resources that are rare or unique to the region.  

b) A thorough assessment of rare plants and rare natural communities, following the CDFG’s Guidelines for Assessing the Effects of Proposed Projects on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants and Natural Communities (note: see Attachment 1, December 1983, revised November 2009).  

c) A current inventory of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within the area of potential effect. The CDFG’s California Natural Diversity Database in Sacramento should be contacted at (916) 322-2493 or www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/ to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code.  

d) An inventory of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect. Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (see CEQA Guidelines, §15380). This should include sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with the CDFG and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. | Environmental impacts | CDFG         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 687        | Edmund Pert       | 5/28/2010  | Letter            | The Draft SEIS/SEIR should provide a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance, and minimizing impacts.  
  
a) A discussion of impacts associated with increased lighting, noise, human activity, changes in drainage patterns, changes in water volume, velocity, and quality, soil erosion, and/or sedimentation in streams and water courses on or near the project site, with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts should be included.  
b) Project impacts should be analyzed relative to their indirect impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands (e.g., preserve lands associated with Multi-Habitat Planning Area under the MSCP Subarea Plan). Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated and provided. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address: project-related changes on drainage patterns on and downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-project fate of runoff from the project site. The discussions should also address the proximity of the extraction activities to the water table, whether dewatering would be necessary, and the potential resulting impacts on the habitat, if any, supported by the groundwater.  
c) The zoning of areas for development projects or other uses that are nearby or adjacent to natural areas may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the environmental document.  
d) A cumulative effects analysis should be developed as described.                        | Environmental impacts | CDFG         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>687 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Rare Natural Communities (note: see Attachment 2) from project-related impacts. The CDFG considers these communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should include mitigation measures for adverse project-related impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, on-site habitat restoration or enhancement should be discussed in detail. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, off-site mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>For proposed preservation and/or restoration, the Draft SEIS/SEIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values from direct and indirect negative impacts. The objective should be to offset the project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>In order to avoid impacts to nesting birds, the Draft SEIS/SEIR should require that clearing of vegetation, and when biologically warranted construction, occur outside of the peak avian breeding season which generally runs from March 1 through August 31 (as early as January 15 for some raptors). If project construction is necessary during the bird breeding season, a qualified biologist should conduct a survey for nesting birds, within three days prior to the work in the area, and ensure no nesting birds in the project area would be impacted by the project. If an active nest is identified, a buffer shall be established between the construction activities and the nest so that nesting activities are not interrupted. The buffer shall be a minimum width of 300 feet (500 feet for raptors), shall be delineated by temporary fencing, and shall remain in effect as long as construction is occurring or until the nest is no longer active. No project construction shall occur within the fenced nest zone until the young have fledged, are no longer being fed by the parents, have left the nest, and will no longer be impacted by the project.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The CDFG generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Edmund Pert</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant revegetation techniques. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of the mitigation site; (b) the plant species to be used, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) planting schedule; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) specific success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>CDFG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Comment Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Name of Commenter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The EIR should evaluate whether conditions within the project area may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National Priorities List (NPL): A list maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Envirostor (formerly CalSites): A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), accessible through DTSC’s website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by USEPA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by USEPA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Counties and Cities maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The United States Army Corps of Engineers, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90017, (213) 452-3908, maintains a list of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If necessary, DTSC would require an oversight agreement in order to review such documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Any environmental investigations, sampling and/or remediation for a site should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous substance cleanup. The findings of any investigations, including any Phase I or II Environmental Site Assessment Investigations, should be summarized in the document. All sampling results in which hazardous substances were found above regulatory standards should be clearly summarized in a table. All closure, certification or remediation approval reports by regulatory agencies should be included in the EIR.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>If buildings, other structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are planned to be demolished, an investigation should also be conducted for the presence of other hazardous chemicals, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If other hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints (LPB) or products, mercury or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Future project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. Sampling may be required. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed and not simply placed in another location onsite. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to such soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, sampling should be conducted to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during any construction or demolition activities. If necessary, a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency should be conducted by a qualified health risk assessor to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should also obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942. Certain hazardous waste treatment processes or hazardous materials, handling, storage or uses may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Al Shami</td>
<td>5/28/2010</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>DTSC can provide cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies that are not responsible parties, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA or VCA, please see <a href="http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields">www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields</a> or contact Ms. Maryam Tasnif- Abbasi, DTSC’s Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Calif Dept Toxic Sub Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Conditional Support of LRT Alt 1 - While the current plan has looked at a number of different routes through La Jolla and University City, I’d like to express my conditional support for LRT Alt 1 (which combines LRT Alts 1, 4, &amp; 5). My conditional support is due to the lack of a station being proposed at the VA Medical Center.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I’m a former Marine and Viet Nam Vet. While in Viet Nam, I volunteered to be a door gunner on the CH-46 Sea Knight helicopters. Life expectancy for the flight crew was approximately 6 months. Most of our wounded had a leg blown off or damaged, many had an arm mostly blown off, many were just full of holes squirting blood, and a lot of them came back in body bags. I was lucky, I did not get injured or wounded, but 2 of my best friends were blown to pieces. Currently, I am handicapped with a replaced hip and I receive medical care at the VA Medical Center in La Jolla.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>ALL OF YOUR PROPOSED ROUTES HAVE A FATAL FLAW IN NOT HAVING A TROLLEY STOP AT THE VA MEDICAL CENTER. We’re here today discussing the different routes proposed for this transit project only because of the sacrifice our vets made to protect our right to free speech and to fight against the tyrannical govts that have gone to war against us and our way of life. I’m writing this on Memorial Day, which we as a Nation have dedicated to honor our war dead and those who gave their life to defend our country. We also need to honor those who have lived through their military experience, but have suffered damage from enemy fire or their experience in fighting for our cherished freedom. We also have vets who risked their life to fight for their country, and now find themselves in need of the medical attention they can only receive at the VA Medical Center.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>OUR MILITARY VETS HAVE EARNED THE RIGHT TO HAVE A TROLLEY STATION CLOSE TO THE WEST OR EAST ENTRANCES OF THE VA MEDICAL CENTER. There are 3 major entrances to the VA Medical Center. The Main Entrance is on the south, but this location probably isn’t best for a Trolley Station. There is also an entrance on the west which is also the Emergency Entrance which there is plenty of room for a Trolley Station and elevated trolley route on the way to UCSD. On the east side there is also a major entrance and room for a Trolley Station, but the station needs to be closer to the hospital than the current proposed routes are planned to be located.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>DON'T TELL A VET IN A WHEEL CHAIR THAT HE CAN JUST GO 2 BLOCKS TO THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED TROLLEY STATION. I drove the distance in my can and found it to be over 0.50-mile away, going up and down a steep hill. When you can have stations in downtown that are closer than this, you can certainly accommodate a vet at the VA Medical Center who had his legs blown off in a war. Even in your current plan, you have able-bodied executives and workers who are given a Trolley Station at Executive Drive, which is 2 blocks away from the Trolley Station proposed for UTC. Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying there shouldn't be a station at Executive Drive, I'm merely saying we need to respect and honor our vets and give them a Trolley Station close to the entrance to the VA Medical Center. DON'T TELL A VETERAN TO TAKE A SHUTTLE TO THE UCSD TROLLEY STATION. Once again, you're treating the vet as a second class citizen, that college students are more important than a vet who risked his life and suffered an injury. When a person is in a wheel chair, or if he/she has difficulty walking, to have to wait for a shuttle to make the connection to the Trolley Station, this is too long to wait. Their life is already slowed down by their handicap. It's unconscionable that the trolley route would be proposed without a stop at the VA Medical Center. I'm also not saying that there shouldn't be a Trolley Station specifically for students going to UCSD. This station is important too! But don't discount our vets who have earned the right to have their own Trolley Station more than anyone!</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>DON'T HONOR JUST THE VETS WHO HAVE DIED--AND REFUSE TO HONOR THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN WOUNDED OR INJURED. It's important that we honor all vets and even if a Trolley Station at the VA Medical Center wouldn't provide the ridership numbers you would like for a traditional station, this station will have a large number of handicapped vets using it, giving it extra points for vets that are and are not handicapped. The VA Medical Center also hires a large number of health care professionals who would use the trolley if the Trolley Station was closer and more convenient. Many of these people are also vets.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Billy Paul</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>IT'S IMPORTANT THAT IN THE SCOPLING PROCESS YOU CONSIDER A TROLLEY ROUTE THAT STOPS CLOSE TO THE VA MEDICAL CENTER, EITHER CLOSE TO THE WEST ENTRANCE OR CLOSE TO THE EAST ENTRANCE, AND NOT A LONG DISTANCE AWAY.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/_modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I would like the Draft SEIS/SEIR to specifically address ridership models for the trolley extension broken out into at least two riderships levels: ridership from downtown to a proposed Pacific Beach (PB) station and then ridership to University City.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I would like the Draft SEIS/SEIR to provide the following travel times comparisons: from downtown to UTC and UCSD using existing express bus transit (Routes 30, 50, and 150) vs trolley times; from Grand Ave/Mission Blvd in PB to UCSD via the existing Route 30 vs a bus to a PB trolley stop and to UCSD from there; and, from Grand Ave/ Mission Blvd in PB to Downtown San Diego via the existing Route 30 vs a bus to a PB trolley stop and to downtown from there.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>In order to encourage residents and visitors to utilize public transit, it is imperative to make public transit easy, convenient, and quick. Please address how the proposed Trolley will improve the ease of use and shorten the travel times.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Existing express bus service is more convenient than taking both a bus and a trolley. The choice to take one bus vs the need to transfer between bus and trolley influences whether I take public transit or drive. Therefore, I would like the transit models to specifically address wasted rider time in transferring and in missed connections, which are very frequent, especially late in the evening at OTTC. If there are plans to address this issue as part of this project, they should be elaborated upon in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>When evaluating my transportation options, the ability to perform work while riding is one of the key factors in choosing public transit. However, every transfer reduces my work time and my desire to take public transit. Please address how travel time will be minimized and work time maximize when using the trolley. Specifically, the study should indicate total travel time and total work time, assuming work is performed on a laptop computer.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>As a large number of public transit riders in PB use both bikes and buses to commute to work, I would like the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address how connections would be made and what steps the project is considering to maximize commutes that use a combination of bikes and buses.</td>
<td>Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Balboa Ave Station is extremely dangerous to reach by foot and bike (from PB and Clairemont). The Draft SEIS/SEIR should address improvements in the area to facilitate bike and ped access to/from the station, to/from both North Clairemont and East PB.</td>
<td>Stations, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Garnet Ave/Mission Bay Dr intersection is extremely congested, and is dangerous and difficult for peds and bikes to cross. In the last few years, a number of peds have been hit and some killed at this intersection. Given the heavy vehicle traffic at this intersection, and it's danger to non-motorized traffic, request that the Draft SEIS/SEIR address how this intersection could be made safe for people trying to access the trolley station, including the costs and property acquisitions that would be needed to improve the intersection. Furthermore, even PB residents taking a bus to the trolley would be subjected to significant traffic congestion, resulting in delays. Please address how buses will be able to bypass the traffic back up on weekday mornings and weekends during the summer to reach the trolley station in an expedited manner.</td>
<td>Costs, Stations, Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Balboa Ave has limited sidewalks and a very narrow bike lane. The Draft SEIS/SEIR should address improvements in the Balboa Ave Station area including, but not limited to, non-motorized movement under I-5 along Balboa Ave, without any negative impacts to the native trees growing in the Balboa Ave median strip. Additional considerations include the following: how to create a grade separated bike route along Balboa Ave; how to ensure that adequate wheelchair-accessible sidewalks are available on the north and south side of Balboa Avenue; and, how to provide for safe and legal drop-off and pick-up points for transit riders.</td>
<td>Schedule, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>As many Trolley riders traveling to/from PB will be tourists, I would like all plans for a PB trolley stop to address visitor amenities including, but not limited to, tourist information, transit information, light food, and sundries, in order to make the tourist experience convenient. Furthermore, I would like details on staffing levels at this trolley station.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Respectfully request that the Draft SEIR/SEIS address the feasibility of relocating the proposed PB Trolley station south about ¼ mile. This would place it on the east side of I-5 and parallel to the North Mission Bay Drive entrance to Mission Bay Park. A tunnel under I-5 would allow trolley patrons to exit the trolley almost directly into Mission Bay Park. There is a parcel of underutilized property at South East Corner of Mission Bay Drive and Rosewood that would function as an ideal bus turn around for PB, could house visitor amenities, and avoid the negative impacts of the previously mentioned items.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3 - I oppose the proposed LRT 3 through Rose Canyon and any other routes that travels outside of the existing railroad right-of-way. I oppose any route through Rose Canyon Open Space Park past the I-5/Gilman Drive off ramp and through any of the parklands of Marian Bear Natural Park.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR provide details for any contour changes to Rose Creek including, but not limited to, plans which would move the alignment of the creek, channelize any portion of the creek, underground any section of the creek or its tributaries, and impede existing creek flow in any manner.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR address the cumulative impacts for other projects proposed for the area when considering the potential impacts of the trolley. These include but are not limited to California High Speed Rail, Amtrak/COASTER improvements, and proposed bridges in the area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Rose Creek is a California impaired water body and therefore I request the Draft SEIS/SEIR identify opportunities for improving water quality in areas along the rail right of way in a manner that increases habitat diversity, minimizes the spread of non-native species of plants and animals, and increase wildlife corridors in the area.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>All mitigation opportunities for work performed adjacent to Rose Creek south of SR 52 and north of Santa Fe St needs to be performed in this stretch of the creek including the impacts of construction and ongoing maintenance of the trolley and we request the Draft SEIS/SEIR to address this issue.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I strongly urge SANDAG to find an alignment that results in a zero loss to existing parks.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The Draft SEIS/SEIR should also address funding for, implementation of, and maintenance of items in the Rose Creek Watershed Alliance Opportunities Assessment, which was accepted as a guidance document for planning in the Rose Creek Watershed by the San Diego City Council in 2008 and is available at <a href="http://rosecreekwatershed.org/">http://rosecreekwatershed.org/</a>, including, but not limited to: Ø New trails to support visitor enjoyment of the area; Ø Safe and legal track railroad track crossings to allow residents of University City, Clairemont, and PB to move freely within these communities on foot and bicycle; and, Ø Restoration of currently degraded habitat and removal of concrete impediments where feasible to allow a more natural wetland habitat to thrive.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Financial, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Karin Zirk</td>
<td>5/31/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I want to insure that no degradation to the Rose Canyon Bike Path is a result of ANY transportation projects in the area. This is one of the most heavily used bike paths in the county and serves as a major non-motorized transportation corridor. Therefore, I specifically request that the Draft SEIS/SEIR address aesthetic, visual, and noise related impacts to the user experience on the Rose Canyon Bike Path. I am highly concerned that the Rose Canyon Bike Path is going to end up between a freeway and a trolley. Currently, the ride provides users the ability to look out through a natural landscape and see nothing but trees, grasses, and coastal sage scrub habitat. Please identify how you will mitigate the loss of this recreational use.</td>
<td>Environmental impacts, Transportation impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>To capture southbound traffic from I-5, allowing a transfer to rail, need a station on Genesee where it crosses a major canyon west of I-5. Lacking this, the system will fail to move traffic from the freeway to the Trolley. A station at this location could service buses coming up from Sorrento Valley and Torrey Pines Mesa, as well as traffic coming south on I-5. It would probably require another bridge or tunnel to cross Genesee to service the parking garage and bus turn around. The parking garage should be located south of Genesee. The access to I-5 north, from eastbound Genesee, may have to be relocated, as the current traffic load is maxing out the current configuration of lights and ramps.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>To get to this proposed new Genesee Ave Station from the UCSD West Station, following LRT Alt 1, a tunnel would need to be built north under Voigt Dr and the Canyon View Pool Complex to the canyon north of the complex. This canyon could be followed to the proposed new Genesee Ave Station. The LRT would then turn east at two potential locations at or near Genesee Ave (Note: See Map 1) and follow Genesee Ave to the UTC Transit Center (Note: See Map 1 for alignment options from UCSD West to UTC. Also, see attachment text for alignment details). When designing the route from the UCSD West Station north, the tunnel grade under Voigt Dr should be planned to allow a steady grade, allowing the Trolley to eventually continue down to Sorrento Valley to connect with the Coaster and Amtrak or High Speed Rail (Note: See Map 2 for alignment options from UCSD to Sorrento Valley. Also, see attachment text for alignment details).</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>At this time, construction of a trolley route to Sorrento Valley may conflict with the eventual right-of-way for the High Speed Rail (HSR), specifically a HSR tunnel from just north of Balboa Ave to Sorrento Valley. Any trolley stations placed there now might not produce the best transfers to and from the future HSR Station. Therefore an extension north of Genesee Ave to Sorrento Valley should wait until decisions are finalized for the HSR route and the HSR tunnel is built.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The location which makes the most sense for the HSR/Coaster Station is in the west end of Sorrento Valley, just east of the Carmel Mountain Rd/Sorrento Valley Rd intersection. The Carmel Mountain Rd exit from the I-5 bypass lanes is only a block from this intersection. Traffic coming north on I-805 or I-5 or south on I-5 or west on Highway 56 all can easily reach this exit. Thus, a station here could service people from Poway west and from I-8 north. Therefore, it would make an excellent location for a transit center in the northern portion of the City of San Diego with transfers to longer distance rail.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>One can currently leave the Sorrento Valley Station after the southbound Amtrak train goes through, drive on I-5 at 65 mph to Santa Fe Street, located just north of Balboa Ave, and wait 8-12 minutes for the train to sail past. So a tunnel from just north of Balboa Ave to Sorrento Valley would cut at least 10 minutes off the travel time to Los Angeles.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>When the line is eventually extended north to Sorrento Valley, “as proposed in Map 2,” it could have one stop near the current Coaster Station and another in the west end of the valley at the HSR Station. Beyond this station, a fleet of feeder buses make more sense than a LRT extension.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>No LRT Alt 3, New Align - Some have suggested that LRT Alt 3 would make more sense if the line is to be extended to Sorrento Valley. But that route is too circuitous. By building the proposed new alignment and then extending it to Sorrento Valley, a more direct route is produced.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed new alignment is likely to attract more riders but could leave the Genesee line as a stub branch line. Problems extending the Genesee line west to the Torrey Pines Golf Course, with stops at the Science Center Drive, General Atomic, Scripps Green, and the Hilton, due to steep grades. Also, this area currently will only generate traffic during rush hours. So it is probably best left to bus and shuttle services. Alternatively, by using a “Y” at the junction with the line between UCSD and Sorrento Valley, the west end of the Genesee line could carry traffic to the HSR station in Sorrento Valley. At the east end, the Genesee line could be extended southeast from the UTC parking lot, along Nobel Drive, descending to the current Amtrak/Coaster line in Rose Canyon. With those trains moved to a Balboa Ave to Sorrento Valley Tunnel, this line should be free to be used by the Trolley to go east to Miramar to service that area. Or it could loop around the north end of the west parking at UTC and follow the mesa east to Miramar.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The proposed new Genesee Ave Station would be about 2 blocks from establishments on Science Center Drive and about the same distance from the Scripps Hospital's Emergency Reception Room. While these would not generate great volumes of traffic, they would augment those arriving via bus and car. Sidewalks are needed to encourage walking traffic.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Until a “HSR and/or Coaster” station is developed near the Carmel Mountain Rd/Sorrento Valley Rd intersection, the proposed new Genesee Ave Station would be the station to capture all traffic from the Del Mar Heights/Carmel Valley and northern areas. Even when the HSR/Coaster station is built, this station would capture traffic going to and from the Torrey Pines Mesa area. To capture the drive-to traffic, parking is required (note: see attachment for proposed parking locations and associated traffic considerations). Bus pullouts, for both east and west bound traffic, and bus parking would also be needed.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>The current LRT Alternatives will not capture the traffic coming south on I-5 to the area south of UCSD. By building a station near Genesee Ave at the canyon just west of I-5, this traffic could be captured. In addition this route could prepare the system for an extension to Sorrento Valley to a relocated Coaster/Amtrak Station.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Stations, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>From La Jolla Parkway (Ardath Rd) and University City, a lot of traffic heads south, destined for Pacific Beach, Mission Valley, and downtown. Also, there is traffic from La Jolla, University City, and North Clairemont going to UCSD. Some of this traffic could be diverted to transit if a trolley station were provided at SR 52, with bus transfer, park-and-ride, and kiss-and-ride options. Although the funds needed to construct access to this station are beyond what is available for the current project, planning should be completed for station platforms, parking, ramp locations, etc. (if funds become available, the facilities could be constructed without having to change work done as part of the current project). The proposed new SR 52 Station would have to be located south of the current SR 52 overpasses, as far south as the point where the current bike path joins Santa Fe St, to allow ramp structures or access roads to take traffic from SR 52 down to the rail lines (Note: See attached map and text for access road options). South of this station location, there are businesses located between the tracks and Rose Creek - arrangements should be made to allow foot traffic, from businesses north of Jutland Dr, to come through their property to the station. Sidewalks should be also provided from the trailer park to the station.</td>
<td>Stations, Financial, Transportation impacts</td>
<td>General comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Pacific Beach (PB) is a major generator of potential Trolley riders, as many UCSD students and employees live in PB. However, getting them from their residents to the Trolley is a major challenge. The Mission Bay Dr and Garnet Ave/Balboa Ave intersection is one of the busiest in the city. Westbound traffic for this intersection light is often backed up for several cycles. Eastbound traffic on Balboa Ave isn’t much better - east of I-5, there is a dangerous cross traffic area, including vehicles exiting northbound I-5 and vehicles headed for Morena Blvd (the same move that traffic seeking to get into the Balboa Ave Station parking lot would have to make). Westbound traffic has merge problems as well. Getting from the Balboa Ave Station parking lot into westbound Balboa Ave traffic would require crossing traffic and merging, followed by congestion at Mission Bay Dr.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Name of Commenter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>Rob Langsdorf</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Have the city provide a connection from Grand Ave to the Balboa Ave Station, crossing Mission Bay Dr, I-5, and the railroad tracks on an aerial structure, merging into Morena Blvd. West of I-5, if this route flew over Bunker Hill St, it would reach Morena Blvd on a curve. The next street south is Glendora St, which would result in an intersection with Morena Blvd where a turning challenging already exists. The third street south is Rosewood St, which would have to fly over a portion of the golf course; however, it would intersect Morena far enough south of the station to provide a reasonable place for on- and off-ramps to touch down.</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>Cynthia Castro</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I just moved to San Diego from Oregon and the #1 largest barrier for me truly loving life in San Diego is my daily commute--the traffic, congestion, safety concerns, and my contribution of GHGs to the environment. Protecting the environment is incredibly important to me, as I have 2 little kids and I want to preserve the quality of life here for them and future generations.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>Cynthia Castro</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>My husband and I are able to carpool most of the time, but even then I feel like he and I could be one less car on the road, and most of the vehicles I see commuting are single occupancy. I've dreamed of another option to take more cars off the road and feel like many people would jump on board if it meant better commutes and protecting the environment.</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>Cynthia Castro</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am a proponent of public transportation. Unfortunately, given our current system, I am unable to rely on public transportation. I live in Rancho Penasquitos, so I take SR 56 west, I-5 south, and exit on Genessee Avenue. SR 56 west gets incredibly congested during peak commute hours (which is when I commute).</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>Cynthia Castro</td>
<td>5/10/2010</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I am writing in support of the extension of the San Diego Trolley system; however, I don’t know San Diego well enough to know if requesting a line that runs from Rancho Penasquitos/Poway/Rancho Bernardo to UCSD and elsewhere is even realistic.</td>
<td>Alternatives, Alignments, Transit technologies/modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
Notes From Agency Meetings
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: U.S. Army Corp

Meeting Time: 8:15 a.m., May 20, 2010

Meeting Location: SANDAG
401 B Street, Conf. Rm. 8C
San Diego, CA 92101

Attendees:

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
Greg Gastelum (619) 699-7378 ggas@sandag.org
Leslie Blanda (619) 699-6907 lbl@sandag.org

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
Shanti Santulli
Project Manager, South Coast Branch
Regulatory Division
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Los Angeles District
6010 Hidden Valley Road, Suite 105, Carlsbad, CA 92011
Tel: 760.602.4834; Fax: 760.602.4848
Shanti.A.Santulli@usace.army.mil

Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)
Dennis Henderson (619) 525-8387 henderson@pbworld.com

Dudek & Associates
Sherrie Miller

The following summarizes the highlights of the meeting held at the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers on May 20, 2010.

Discussion Summary:

Leslie Blanda presented the background and history of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Discussed the Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report was issued on April 28, 2010 and the CEQA scoping period was being conducted from May 3rd through June 1, 2010. Provided a description of the alignments three LRT alternatives approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for scoping and the LRT, BRT and commuter rail alternatives considered and eliminated prior to scoping. Discussed the anticipated structures that may be required over the San Diego River, Tecolote Creek, and Rose Creek. A copy of the Project Fact Sheet, Scoping Information Brochure, and Public Involvement Brochure was passed out to all meeting participants.

Shanti recently joined the Corp and requested copies of past correspondence from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers related to previous environmental documents prepared for the project, a copy of the NOP, and information on contact information on the project lead for FTA.

Minutes prepared by: Greg Gastelum
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: San Diego River Conservancy

Meeting Time: 9:00 a.m., May 20, 2010

Meeting Location: SANDAG
401 B Street, Conf. Rm. 8C
San Diego, CA 92101

Attendees:

**San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)**
Greg Gastelum (619) 699-7378 ggas@sandag.org
Leslie Blanda (619) 699-6907 lbl@sandag.org

**San Diego River Conservancy**
Michael Nelson, Executive Officer
1350 Front Street Suite 3024
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 645-3183; Fax: (619) 238-7068
mnelson@sdrc.ca.gov

**Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)**
Dennis Henderson (619) 525-8387 henderson@pbworld.com
Lawrence Spurgeon (619) 321-4182 spurgeon@pbworld.com

The following summarizes the highlights of the meeting held at the San Diego River Conservancy on May 25, 2010.

**Discussion Summary:**

Explained that the intent of the meeting was to brief the San Diego River Conservancy on the Mid-Coast project and answer any questions the agency might have in providing comments to SANDAG during the scoping period.

Leslie Blanda presented the background and history of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Identified that the Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report was issued on April 28, 2010 and the CEQA scoping period was being conducted from May 3 through June 1, 2010. Provided a description of the three LRT alternatives approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for scoping and the LRT, BRT and commuter rail alternatives considered and eliminated prior to scoping. Discussed the anticipated structures that may be required over the San Diego River. A copy of the Project Fact Sheet, Scoping Information Brochure, and Public Involvement Brochure was handed out to all meeting participants.

Michael Nelson shared information on the establishment of the Conservancy through State legislation, the Conservancy being a non-regulatory agency governed by a 13-member board consisting of both state and local representatives whose primary focus is the preservation and enhancement of the San Diego River Area and build a river park and trail from the Pacific Ocean to Julian. Michael will be taking direction from the board on any comments to be submitted to SANDAG during the scoping period. He also recommended coordinating with Rob Hutsel of the San Diego River Park Foundation.

Meeting Summary prepared by: Greg Gastelum
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: California Department of Fish and Game

Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m., May 26, 2010

Meeting Location: Department of Fish and Game, South Coast Region
4949 Viewridge Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

Attendees:

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
Greg Gastelum (619) 699-7378 ggas@sandag.org

Fish and Game
David Lawhead (858) 627-3997 dlawhead@dfg.ca.gov
Stephen Juarez (858) 467-4212 sjuarez@dfg.ca.gov

Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)
Dennis Henderson (619) 525-8387 henderson@pbworld.com

The following summarizes the highlights of the meeting held at the Department of Fish and Game offices on May 26, 2010.

Discussion Summary:

Greg Gastelum presented the background and history of the Mid-Coast Corridor Project. He reported that the project is currently in CEQA scoping. Greg also described the three LRT alternatives approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors and the BRT and commuter rail alternatives considered and eliminated prior to scoping. He noted that the Draft Comparative Evaluation Report can be downloaded from the SANDAG website.

The Fish and Game staff noted that the canyon near Thornton Hospital under LRT Alternatives 3 and 6 could be an issue because it has been identified for mitigation. The California gnatcatcher has been noted in the canyon. An EIR is currently in circulation for the Thornton Hospital expansion and should be reviewed. The EIR references the biological surveys that have been conducted in the canyon.

The Fish and Game staff noted that the Multiple Species Comprehensive Plan (MSCP) lists all the species. The project should be evaluated for consistency with the plan. It also is important that impacts on connectivity of wildlife corridors be evaluated. If adjacent to corridors and MSCP areas, mitigation should be incorporated into the project design.

It was recommended that SANDAG meet again with Fish and Game staff once the Locally Preferred Alternative is selected so that location of mitigation can be discussed. It is best to coordinate on mitigation before completing the EIS/EIR. It also was recommended that SANDAG contact the City of San Diego MSCP staff. The staff are listed on the City website. The Fish and Game letter to the NOP will be mailed out by the end of the week.
Minutes prepared by Dennis Henderson
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April 28, 2010

File Number 1041501

TO: Agencies, Organizations, and Interested Parties

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

PROJECT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project would provide for transit improvements within the Mid-Coast Corridor, generally defined as the area centering on Interstate 5 (I-5) and extending from downtown San Diego on the south to University City on the north. The corridor is bound by the Pacific Ocean on the west and Interstate 805 and State Route 163 on the east. The corridor is located entirely within the City of San Diego and includes the following communities (either in entirety or in portions of): downtown San Diego, Uptown, Old Town, Mission Beach, Pacific Beach, Linda Vista, Clairemont Mesa, La Jolla, and University City. The Mid-Coast Corridor is similar to the corridor considered in the Mid-Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR). A map of the project study area, located within the Mid-Coast Corridor, is attached.

A variety of land uses exist within the corridor, including single- and multi-family residential, institutional, commercial (employment, retail, and visitor), and industrial. Key employment and activity centers also are located within the corridor, particularly within the downtown San Diego and University City areas.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are preparing a Draft SEIS/SEIR for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego, California. The FTA is serving as lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act, and SANDAG is serving as lead agency for the California Environmental Quality Act.
The Draft SEIS/SEIR will build upon and update previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies and decisions for the Mid-Coast Corridor. These include:

- The AA/DEIS/DEIR, completed in February 1995
- The Final Environmental Impact Report, completed in December 1995
- Adoption, in 1995, of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)—an 11-mile extension of the Trolley light rail transit (LRT) system from Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) to University City
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the first portion of the LPA, extending from OTTC to Balboa Avenue, completed in 2001
- An update to the 1995 LPA alignment, adopted in December 2003, to serve the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus on both the sides of I-5 and to connect the Trolley with the University Towne Centre (UTC) Transit Center
- Inclusion of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in the TransNet extension, the county’s half-cent transportation sales tax measure voters approved in November 2004

The Draft SEIS/SEIR also will include an analysis of changed conditions in the Mid-Coast Corridor since the previous environmental studies were completed.

**PURPOSE OF PROJECT**

The purpose of the proposed project is to implement a transit project that addresses the identified transportation needs for the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project would improve public transit services between University City, Old Town, and downtown San Diego and would connect corridor residents with other Trolley lines, thereby enhancing direct public access to other regional activity centers. The project would improve travel options to employment, education, medical, and retail centers for corridor residents, commuters, and visitors. The Mid-Coast Corridor LRT Project is included in the SANDAG 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways for the Future (RTP) under both the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios (www.sandag.org/programs/transportation/comprehensive_transportation_projects/2030rtp/2007rtp_A_final.pdf).

**ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION**

The transit alternatives under consideration include:

*No-Build Alternative:* This alternative (and all other alternatives) would include existing transit services and the highway and transit improvements from the RTP Revenue Constrained Scenario, including major capital improvements and transit operating improvements.

*LRT Alternatives:* These alternatives would utilize LRT and operate via the I-5/Voigt Drive/Genesee Avenue, Genesee Avenue Tunnel, or I-5/Thornton Hospital alignments described below (see attached map of LRT alternatives).
• **I-5/Voigt Drive/Genesee Avenue Alternative (LRT Alternative 1):** A variation of the 2003 adopted LPA, this alternative would follow I-5, Voigt Drive, and Genesee Avenue, from OTTC to University City. From OTTC to north of State Route 52 (SR 52), the alternative would travel within the existing Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)/San Diego Northern Railway (SDNR) Right-of-Way, which is currently owned by MTS. North of SR 52, the alternative would travel adjacent to both the east and west sides of I-5 to the UCSD West Campus, then travel along Voigt Drive and Genesee Avenue to terminal station at the UTC Transit Center. Alignment options would be provided along Voigt Drive.

• **Genesee Avenue Tunnel Alternative (LRT Alternative 3):** This alternative would follow the existing MTS/SDNR Right-of-Way from OTTC to University City (Genesee Avenue), and then follow Genesee Avenue north and Executive Drive and Miramar Street west, with a terminal station at the UCSD West Campus.

• **I-5/Thornton Hospital Alternative (LRT Alternative 6):** Like the I-5/Voigt Drive/Genesee Avenue Alternative, this alternative would follow I-5 from OTTC to the UCSD West Campus, utilizing mostly the existing MTS/SDNR Right-of-Way. From the UCSD West Campus, this alternative would turn east, looping around Thornton Hospital on the south, and then following Miramar Street and Executive Drive east and Genesee Avenue south to the UTC Transit Center station terminus.

In addition to the alternatives described above, other transit alternatives identified through the scoping process that would satisfy the project purpose and need with fewer costs, greater effectiveness, or fewer potential environmental impacts will be evaluated for inclusion in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The Transportation System Management Alternative, which will be included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR as an FTA New Starts baseline, not a reasonable transit alternative, would emphasize transportation system upgrades and would serve as an enhancement to the No-Build Alternative.

**PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

The purpose of the SEIS/SEIR environmental analysis/review process is to explore, in a public setting, the effects of the proposed project and its alternatives on the physical, human, and natural environment. SANDAG and the FTA will evaluate all significant environmental, social, and economic impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed project. Impact areas to be addressed include: transportation; land use, zoning and economic development; secondary development; land acquisition, displacements and relocations; cultural resources (including historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources) and parklands/recreation areas; neighborhood compatibility and environmental justice; visual and aesthetic impacts; natural resources (including air quality, noise and vibration, wetlands, water resources, geology/soils, and hazardous materials); energy use; safety and security; and wildlife and ecosystems (including endangered species). Feasible measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate all adverse impacts will be identified and evaluated.

**SCOPING MEETINGS**

The FTA and SANDAG invite all interested individuals and organizations, public agencies, and Native American Tribes to comment on the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including the project’s purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied, the impacts to be evaluated, and the evaluation methods to be used. Comments should focus on: alternatives that may be less costly or have less
environmental or community impacts while achieving similar transportation objectives, and the identification of any significant social, economic, or environmental issues relating to the alternatives.

Written comments on the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including the project's purpose and need, the alternatives to be considered, the impacts to be evaluated, and the methodologies to be used in the evaluations should be sent to SANDAG on or before June 1, 2010, at the address below. See **ADDRESSES** below for the address to which written public comments may be sent. Scoping meetings to accept comments on the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR will be held on the following dates:

- **Public Meeting**: Wednesday, May 5, 2010, from 4 to 7 p.m., at SANDAG, Boardroom, 401 B Street, Suite 700, San Diego, CA 92101
- **Public Meeting**: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, from 3 to 6 p.m., at UCSD, Price Center East Ballroom/John Muir Conference Room, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093
- **Public Meeting**: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, from 4 to 7 p.m., at Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center, Theater/Gallery, 4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
- **Public Meeting**: Thursday, May 20, 2010, from 4 to 7 p.m., at Clairemont High School, Cafeteria, 4150 Ute Street, San Diego, CA 92117
- **Public Meeting**: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, from 4 to 7 p.m., at Caltrans, Garcia Conference Room, 4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, CA 92110

The project's purpose and need and the conceptual alternatives proposed for study will be presented at the scoping meetings. The buildings used for the scoping meetings are accessible to persons with disabilities. Any individual who requires special assistance to participate in the scoping meetings, such as a sign language interpreter, should contact Anne Steinberger, SANDAG, at (619) 699-1937 or ast@sandag.org.

Scoping materials will be available at the meetings and are available on the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org/midcoast). Hard copies of the scoping materials also may be obtained from Ms. Steinberger.

**ADDRESSES**: Written comments should be sent to Anne Steinberger, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101 or ast@sandag.org. The locations of the scoping meetings are provided above.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) have initiated the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in San Diego, California. The FTA is serving as lead agency for purposes of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental clearance and SANDAG is serving as lead agency for purposes of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental clearance.

The requirements and guidance for public involvement during the development of the environmental document are described in the NEPA and CEQA guidelines. Additional public involvement guidance is provided in the Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration Interim Policy on Public Involvement.

The SEIS/SEIR will build upon previous transit planning, engineering, and environmental studies completed for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. These studies will be incorporated, by reference, into the SEIS/SEIR.

Coordination with the agencies responsible for approving or permitting the project and public involvement have been an on-going part of the planning and environmental review process since the inception of the Mid-Coast Corridor project planning. The goal of the Mid-Coast Corridor Public Involvement Plan is to foster a public involvement process that will support the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. This public involvement plan will build upon the coordination and public involvement that was initiated during the previous planning and environmental review for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project conducted in 1995 and 2001. In addition to the public involvement addressed in this plan, the project will also include public agency coordination as part of the environmental process, as outlined in the Final Agency Involvement Plan.

1.1 Project Overview and Background

The Mid-Coast Corridor starts at Downtown San Diego, extending to the existing Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) north to North University City, as shown in Figure 1-1. The corridor is entirely within the City of San Diego and includes the following communities: University City, including North University City and South University City; La Jolla; Clairemont Mesa; Pacific Beach; Mission Beach; Linda Vista; Old Town; Midway; Middletown; Little Italy and Downtown San Diego.

The Mid-Coast Corridor features a variety of physical terrains. A narrow coastal beach extends the entire length of the corridor. Mission Bay Park lies immediately north of the Interstate 8 (I-8) freeway and west of the Interstate 5 (I-5) freeway, at the southern end of the corridor. Many inland areas, particularly in the northern portion
of the corridor (north of State Route 52 or SR-52), have steep hillsides and narrow canyons.

A number of large, environmentally sensitive lands are also present within the corridor, including: the Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Mission Bay Park, San Diego River Park and the Marian Bear Memorial Park.

The corridor is characterized by a variety of land uses, including commercial, office, residential, recreational, and educational land uses. Major employment and retail centers are located in University City and Clairemont. Light industrial uses are located along the I-5 Freeway corridor, and single- and multi-family housing units are found throughout the corridor. Key employment and activity centers, located within or adjacent to the corridor include:

- The Golden Triangle;
- The University of California San Diego (UCSD), the University of San Diego (USD), and Mesa College;
- Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC), La Jolla Square Shopping Center, Mission Valley shopping centers, the Fashion Valley Mall and Horton Plaza;
- The Veterans Administration, Scripps Memorial, Scripps Green, and UCSD Thornton Hospitals;
- The Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Gateway, Qualcomm, General Atomics, the Neurosciences Institute, Novartis, and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography;
- Sea World, Old Town State Park, and Mission Bay Park; and
- Downtown San Diego.

The original Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), which was adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) in 1995, combined with revisions that were approved by the SANDAG Board in 2003, comprise the current LPA, which extends the existing trolley system from downtown to the existing OTTC north to UCSD and the Westfield UTC shopping center, in North University City.

The LPA would provide connections to other high capacity transit and commuter lines. Connections to the San Diego Trolley Blue and Orange Lines would be provided at Santa Fe Depot in Downtown San Diego. The LPA connection to the San Diego Trolley Green Line, which serves population and employment centers east of the OTTC in Mission Valley, would be provided at OTTC and stops between OTTC and Santa Fe Depot. Connections to the Coaster would also be provided at OTTC and Santa Fe Depot.

The LPA and possible variations identified in response to changed conditions in the Mid-Coast Corridor will be considered in the SEIS/SEIR. These variations may consist of alternative light rail transit (LRT) alignments, station locations, and operating plans. Modal alternatives to the LPA will also be considered following a review of changed conditions in the corridor (since the publication of the 1995 Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report or AA/DEIS/DEIR). These alternatives will be considered and will be presented at the Scoping meetings at the beginning of the environmental review process.
In addition to the LPA and LRT variations, alternatives that will be developed and evaluated, leading up to Scoping for the SEIS/SEIR, are summarized below:

- **No-Build Alternative** – This alternative will include committed highway and transit projects that are part of the Revenue Constrained Scenario of the 2007 update to the *2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP).

- **Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative** – The TSM Alternative would enhance the No-Build Alternative, by emphasizing relatively low-cost transportation system upgrades.

- **Commuter Rail Alternative** – This alternative would use the existing COASTER commuter rail line in the corridor. Capital investments and operational improvements will be identified.

- **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative** – This alternative will use BRT or Rapid Bus to serve activity centers along the north-south axis of the corridor.

To compete successfully for the FTA New Starts funding, SANDAG will have to select a cost effective and financially strong Locally Preferred Alternative and continue to advance supportive land use policies. It will be important for the Board as well as stakeholders to use the FTA criteria when considering project alternatives.

### 1.2 Key Issues to Consider

As the environmental review process gets underway, there are a number of issues to consider and be aware of, including:

- **Issues raised during prior environmental reviews**
  
  During prior environmental review processes, a number of comments were made by public agencies, community groups, interested organizations and individuals. These comments and responses are included in their entirety in the 1995 *Final EIR for the Mid-Coast Corridor* and the 2001 *Mid-Coast Balboa Segment Final EIS*. An awareness and understanding of the comments made in prior reviews is important for the current stage of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project’s development, since similar concerns may be raised during the public review of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The issues raised in comments made in prior environmental review processes include the following:

  - Other modal alternatives were not considered
  - Competition for service with the COASTER
  - Business centers along the corridor are not adequately served
  - Impacts to parks and open space preserves (Rose Canyon, Marian Bear Natural Park, Tecolote Park, Mandell Weiss Eastgate City Park)
  - Public safety impacts
  - Physical impacts to neighborhoods and facilities along the route (reduced access to facilities, noise, visual impacts)
  - Impacts to sensitive biological habitat and wetlands
  - Impacts to bicycle facilities
  - Impacts to vehicular traffic circulation
  - Impacts to public utilities
  - Beach communities are not served by the project
  - Concerns about station locations
- Cost effectiveness of the project

- Varying levels of awareness about the project
  A number of stakeholders in the corridor will have participated in past public involvement efforts associated with prior environmental reviews for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. There may be expectations about the project or assumptions based on information from these prior efforts that need to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, some members of the public will not have the same history of participation, and will need to be educated about the current process and how it relates to past efforts. Efforts will be made to communicate the current alternatives being considered and the environmental review process and how past efforts have informed the current analysis.

- Significant public interest in SANDAG's process for development and evaluation of design and modal alternatives
  Since the approval of the LPA in 1995, there has been increased public interest in and awareness of BRT. Supporters of BRT will want to ensure that it is given fair consideration in comparison to the LPA and other modal alternatives. In addition, the Independent Transit Planning Review committee recommended that a COASTER (Commuter Rail) alternative be considered in the alternatives evaluation.

- Project cost
  Because this is a significant public infrastructure project projected to cost more than $1 billion, the public likely will have a high interest in the project. This interest will be heightened due to current economic conditions.

- Physical impacts of project
  As was the case with prior environmental reviews, the public will be concerned about potential impacts from the project such as noise, visual impacts, changes to community character, station locations and access.

- Compatibility with existing and future plans
  The public will want to ensure that the project is compatible with existing and future plans, including existing land uses, general and community plans, and I-5 expansion plans.

- Relationship to recent State legislation
  State legislation addressing climate change recently has gone into effect. Most relevant to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, SB 375 aims to limit urban sprawl and support urban, walkable developments. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project may help achieve the goals of SB 375 by providing reliable transit that can support existing and new development patterns in the corridor.

- Biological impacts and mitigation
  Potential impacts to biological resources including habitat, watershed, and wetlands, as well as proposed mitigations will be of concern to the public. Areas of particular interest will include environmentally sensitive lands within the corridor, including: Rose Canyon Open Space Park, Mission Bay Park, the Marian Bear Memorial Natural Park and the San Diego River Park.

1.3 Purpose of the Public Involvement Plan

SANDAG intends to embark on a comprehensive public involvement effort to communicate information to the public and to provide opportunities for public input during the environmental review process for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. This project is a high priority for
SANDAG and the region, and is included in the TransNet Early Action Program. This public involvement plan outlines the means by which SANDAG will provide the public with timely information about the project, and identify issues important to the general public and stakeholders.

The public involvement program for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will be wide reaching and thorough, helping SANDAG communicate important information to the public, identify and address issues throughout the process, and incorporate relevant input from affected and interested audiences.

The goal of the Mid-Coast Corridor Public Involvement Plan is to foster a public involvement process that will support the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. This will be achieved by ensuring that the public is provided with timely and useful information about the project, given opportunities to provide public input on draft plans and environmental documents, and made aware of how their comments have been responded to and utilized in the decision-making process. These efforts will help to build and enhance public trust, understanding and confidence in the SANDAG decision making process.

This public involvement plan is intended to be a “living” document. Because of the fluid nature of the public involvement process, this plan may be adjusted to respond to issues and circumstances that arise throughout the process and will also be updated at major milestones in the planning and development process.

### 1.4 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS AND POLICIES FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

#### 1.4.1 Federal and State Guidelines and Requirements for Public Involvement

This Public Involvement Plan has been designed to meet all requirements and guidelines of the various Federal and State statutes addressing public involvement for transportation projects. These statutes include the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Section 1506.6, Public Involvement, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Authority (FHWA/FTA) Interim Policy on Public Involvement. Table 1-1 below summarizes the guidelines and requirements included in each statute or policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute</th>
<th>Public Involvement Guidelines and Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>• Publish Notice of Availability of Draft SEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 45-day public comment period for Draft SEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct public hearing during Draft SEIS public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publish Notice of Availability of Final SEIS with EPA in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Record of Decision by FTA 30 days after filing notice with EPA for Federal Register in availability of Final SEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute</td>
<td>Public Involvement Guidelines and Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>• Publish Notice of Preparation of Draft SEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 30-day Scoping period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct Scoping meetings during Scoping period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invite public to participate in Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publish Notice of Availability of Draft SEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 45-day public comment period on Draft SEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publish Notice of Availability of Final SEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SANDAG Board Action by Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA Interim Policy on Public Involvement</td>
<td>• Clearly-defined purpose and objectives for initiating a public dialogue on transportation plans, programs, and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of specifically who the affected public and other stakeholder groups are with respect to the plan(s), program(s), and project(s) under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of techniques for engaging the public in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification procedures which effectively target affected groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education and assistance techniques which result in an accurate and full public understanding of the transportation problem, potential solutions, and obstacles and opportunities within various solutions to the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow through demonstrating that decision makers seriously considered public input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4.2 Environmental Justice

Consistent with the guidelines discussed above, the Public Involvement Plan will comply with the SANDAG Public Participation Plan (approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors on December 18, 2009), SANDAG Policy 25, Federal Title VI legislation, the Americans with Disabilities Act (as defined in Title 49, Part 37, of the United States Code), Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, Executive Order 13166 on Limited English Proficiency, and other relevant regulations to ensure social equity, environmental justice, non-discrimination and accessibility.

To ensure meaningful access to Limited English Proficient (LEP) persons, SANDAG certifies compliance with the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons.” The policy guidance includes a “Safe Harbor” provision where the USDOT considers the written translation of vital documents in languages other than English (for eligible LEP language groups consisting of 5 percent or more of the population) to be strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s obligations under Title VI. Based on the Census 2000 data, Spanish is the only language in the San Diego Region that meets or exceeds the 5 percent LEP trigger. However, SANDAG will print materials (or provide translation services or bilingual representatives) in any other languages deemed appropriate by SANDAG.
In addition, proactive efforts will be made to ensure that audiences that may not traditionally participate in the transportation planning process are given the opportunity to participate. These audiences include, but are not limited to, minority groups, non-English speakers, lower income households, individuals with disabilities, the elderly, and transit riders.

To reach these audiences, organizations and media outlets representing these communities will be approached to provide project information, solicit participation and input, and provide a means for communicating back with members of these communities. Participation will be encouraged via presentations to these organizations, participation in events sponsored by these organizations or targeted at these audiences, publishing articles in organizational newsletters, and publishing notices and articles in ethnic media outlets. SANDAG has identified a number of local organizations that work with or represent underserved populations in the project area.

SANDAG will work with these groups to identify opportunities to communicate with or solicit input from their constituents to meet their transportation needs. Groups that will be contacted include, but are not limited to:

- Asian Business Association
- San Diego Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
- Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce of San Diego County
- Bayside Community Center
- MAAC Project
- Urban League
- San Diego Workforce Partnership
- SANDAG Accessibility Committee
- Access to Independence of San Diego
- City of San Diego Disabled Services Advisory Committee
- AARP
- Elder housing complexes
- San Diego Organizing Project
- Area students
- Transit riders
- Ethnic media
- Others as identified
2.0 MID-COAST CORRIDOR COMMUNITIES, DEMOGRAPHICS AND PUBLIC STAKEHOLDER CATEGORIES

2.1 Mid-Coast Corridor Communities

The Mid-Coast Corridor is primarily located along the Interstate 5 corridor and extends from Downtown San Diego to the University City community. The study area includes approximately 250,000 residents in the following communities:

- Downtown San Diego
- Little Italy
- Middletown
- Old Town
- Midway
- Linda Vista
- Clairemont
- Bay Park
- Beach communities (Mission Bay, Pacific Beach)
- La Jolla
- University City/Golden Triangle

(Source: SANDAG 2008 Census Estimates)

2.2 Mid-Coast Corridor Demographics

The residents in the Mid-Coast Corridor study area are predominantly Caucasian. The Hispanic population in the corridor is approximately 15 percent, the Asian population is approximately 10%, and the Black population is approximately 3%. Other ethnicities (American Indian, Hawaiian, other) comprise approximately 1 percent of the population. Three percent of the corridor population identifies themselves as more than one race.

(Source: SANDAG 2008 Census Estimates)

According to 2000 census data, nearly 2 percent of the population in the corridor speaks only Spanish, less than 1 percent are Asian Pacific Islanders who speak no English, and less than 1 percent are of other ethnicities who speak no English.

The majority of residents in the Mid-Coast Corridor are between 20 and 64 years of age (66 percent). Those aged 65 and older comprise 15 percent of the population in the corridor, higher than the percentage citywide (11 percent) and region-wide (11 percent).

(Source: SANDAG 2008 Census Estimates)

The average median household income in the Mid-Coast Corridor is $53,304, slightly higher than the citywide median household income of $51,808 and the region-wide median household income of $47,268.

(Source: SANDAG 2008 Census Estimates)

The Mid-Coast Corridor supports more than 300,000 jobs. On either end of the Mid-Coast Corridor are two of San Diego’s largest employment centers. Downtown San Diego employs more than 80,000 people in a number of employment sectors, most of whom commute from various areas of the county. At the north end of the corridor, the University City/Golden Triangle area supports more than 100,000 jobs. It is home to three major medical facilities – UCSD Thornton Hospital, the VA Medical Center and Scripps Memorial Hospital La Jolla – a thriving business district, several hotels and Westfield UTC, a major retail destination. UCSD
also is located in the northern portion of the corridor, and supports thousands of jobs along with a student population of approximately 28,000. In the central corridor, Caltrans, the University of San Diego, SeaWorld, Old Town State Park and Costco are sources of employment.
(Source: SANDAG 2008 Census Estimates)

2.3 Mid-Coast Corridor Public Stakeholder Categories

There are a number of public groups — each with a unique perspective — that will be interested in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project development process. These include organizations and individuals representing the following interests:

- Accessibility Challenged
- Business Organizations
- Community Planning Groups
- Community Services
- Employers/Businesses
- Environmental Groups
- General Public
- Industry Peers & Associations
- Neighborhoods/Residential
- Commercial & retail
- Students
- Taxpayer advocates
- Labor interests
- Tourism
- Transit riders
- Transportation advocates

The focus of this public involvement plan is on public stakeholders. A separate Agency Involvement Plan addresses how SANDAG will coordinate with the various public agencies throughout the development process. A stakeholders list is included in Appendix A.
3.0 KEY INFORMATION AND GOALS FOR THE MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT

The following provides key information about and goals for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project development process:

- **The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will expand the value of the existing transit system and increase mobility within the region.**
  - The project will expand transportation capacity in the corridor.
  - The project will provide high quality, high speed, reliable transit service that will be attractive to all riders.
  - The project will increase mobility choices, providing a reliable and user-friendly alternative to auto travel.
  - The project will provide connections to many of the area’s major attractions and destinations, including Petco Park, the Gaslamp Quarter, Old Town State Park, SDSU, La Jolla, UCSD, and Qualcomm Stadium.
  - The project will connect business centers in downtown, Mission Valley and the Golden Triangle.

- **The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will have a positive impact on the San Diego region and the communities within the Corridor.**
  - The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will help achieve state and regional planning and transportation goals.
  - The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will be a benefit to San Diego’s economy by creating jobs through construction and providing a transit system that facilitates a stable workforce and helps expand consumer access throughout the region.
  - Transit is beneficial to the environment by providing an alternative to traffic congestion, increasing transportation capacity, and reducing air pollution, including greenhouse gases.
  - Ensuring the public’s safety will be a top priority in the design and implementation of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

- **The development process for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has included significant technical analysis and public input.**
  - The current evaluation of alternatives and environmental review will analyze changed conditions that have occurred since prior alternatives analysis and environmental reviews were completed in 1995 and 2001.
  - The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project analysis has been thorough and gave consideration to a number of mode alternatives that compared the feasibility, cost and ridership for providing transit service in the Mid-Coast Corridor.
  - SANDAG will implement a comprehensive public involvement plan to ensure that up-to-date information is provided to stakeholders, ample opportunities are provided for interested members of the public to participate, and information is provided back to the public about how their input will be used in the decision making process.

- **The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has a guaranteed source of local funding through TransNet that will help attract additional federal funding.**
  - 100 percent of operational subsidies for the project are covered through 2048.
- San Diego’s transit system is a leader in farebox recovery (Source: National Transit Database. Current MTS farebox recovery is 43% and national average is 35%)
- The project is being evaluated based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) criteria to ensure that it can successfully compete for FTA New Starts funding.

- The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project has been supported by decision makers and the public.
  - The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project was supported by voters in the 2004 TransNet reauthorization.
  - The SANDAG Board of Directors identified the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project as one of the top regional transit priorities and included it in the TransNet Early Action Program.
4.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Public Involvement Goals and Objectives

The goals for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Public Involvement Plan are as follows:

- Build awareness about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and its importance to regional mobility among the public, including those that the project will serve (transit riders, residents, students and businesses), and the general public.

- Conduct an open and transparent public process that provides up-to-date public information, opportunities for interested members of the public to comment, and provide input to the decision-making process for the project.

- Meet public involvement requirements of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Program.

- Seek opportunities to involve a broad range of stakeholders throughout the Mid-Coast Corridor, including non-traditional groups, to ensure that SANDAG understands the issues from all those who may be impacted by the project and to help guide the decision making process.

- Address social equity and environmental justice issues, to provide information to comply with relevant regulations, including SANDAG Policy 25, Title VI, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, Executive Order 13166 on Limited English Proficiency and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Achieving the following measurable objectives during the environmental review process will help demonstrate that the goals have been met:

- Increase hits on project Web site by 10 percent from the baseline of 2,380 hits
- Display project information at five high-traffic locations in the corridor
- Make 30 presentations through speakers bureau program
- Distribute three issues of Mid-Coast eBlast
- Participate in three community events
- Issue three news releases
- Conduct 15 stakeholder briefings
- Conduct three meetings of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group
- Conduct five scoping meetings during the Scoping period
- Conduct four public hearings/meetings during the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Study/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) public review period

4.2 Public Involvement Strategies

The following strategies will be implemented to achieve the objectives discussed above.

- Establish a clear project identity and convey consistent messages about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, its importance to increasing mobility in the region, and its benefits to the community and region.
Involve public stakeholders in the process on a regular basis to foster understanding and agreement on issues related to the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

Use a variety of communication methods to reach audiences including presentations, one-on-one/small group meetings, public workshops, written materials, online and media communication.

Provide the public with up-to-date information about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project on a regular basis through presentations, the Web site and online communications, written materials and news updates.

Document public comments received during the public involvement process.

Provide information to the public about the environmental review process and opportunities for review of public documents and opportunities for comments.

Provide information to decision makers regarding comments received throughout the public involvement process.

Utilize traditional and new media to convey project information to a broad audience.

Assess the effectiveness of the Public Involvement Plan at the conclusion of each phase to evaluate how the strategies and tactics worked and what enhancements could be made for future phases.

4.3 Public Involvement Process

Implementing the strategies listed above will involve a number of coordinated tactics executed in conjunction with key project development milestones. These tactics will involve face-to-face communication with stakeholders, written and online communications, and media relations. Public involvement tactics that will be employed are described below in a sequential manner associated with the following phases of the public involvement process:

1. Early Public Involvement
2. Public Involvement During Scoping
3. Public Involvement Prior to Circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR
4. Public Involvement During Draft SEIS/SEIR Public Review
5. Public Involvement Prior to the Final SEIS/SEIR and Record of Decision
6. Public Involvement Subsequent to the Record of Decision
7. Plan Assessment

4.3.1 Early Public Involvement

Early public involvement activities provide the opportunity to introduce the public to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and its development process, gain initial feedback about how they would like to be involved, and to prepare for the Scoping period. Public involvement tactics during this period include:
• Prepare informational materials to help educate the public about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project

Informational materials to support the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Public Involvement Plan will be posted at www.sandag.org/midcoast as well as on www.keepsandiegomoving.com/midcoast. These materials include project information, project map, fact sheet, Frequently Asked Questions, and multimedia presentations, videos, and other information. These materials will provide information about the project, the development process, and information and/or referrals about how to get involved in the process. These materials will be updated as needed throughout the process. The Web site will provide an opportunity to learn about the project online and the ability to register for future e-mail newsletters and updates. It also will provide access to project materials and documents, including fact sheets, news releases, project documents (NOP, Draft SEIS/SEIR), and images to download. The Web site also will provide interactive and other multimedia materials.

• Conduct stakeholder briefings

Conducting briefings with a representative group of key stakeholders prior to the beginning of the Scoping period will provide an opportunity to introduce the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the development process and the upcoming opportunities for public involvement. These briefings will help SANDAG assess the level of awareness about the project and identify issues to address through public involvement activities.

Topics to be covered during the briefings include:

- Preliminary project information
- Understanding of the process and how they can provide input
- Input on proposed means of public involvement
- Recommendations on other stakeholders to involve

The following groups/individuals will be approached for briefings:

- SANDAG Accessibility Committee
- Access 2 Independence
- San Diego County Taxpayers Association
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Convention & Visitors Bureau
- Golden Triangle Chamber of Commerce
- Downtown San Diego Partnership
- University Community Planning Group
- Clairemont Community Planning Group
- Linda Vista Planning Group
- Centre City Advisory Committee
- Scripps Memorial Hospital La Jolla
- VA Medical Center
- Costco
- Friends of Rose Canyon
- San Diego River Foundation
- La Jolla Village Square
- Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
- San Diego Mormon Temple
- La Jolla Country Day School
- Move San Diego
- San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
- San Diego Workforce Partnership
Convene Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group

The Mid-Coast Corridor comprises a large geographical area, and there are a number of stakeholders that are interested in the project. To help manage the effort to provide regular project updates, seek input from these numerous stakeholders, and provide regular feedback about how their input is used, a Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group will be convened.

The Working Group will serve as a forum for the exchange of information throughout the project’s development. Working with this group will provide SANDAG with an opportunity to engage in dialog with and gain input from these stakeholders at key milestones in the environmental review process. Members of the Working Group can help convey project information to a wider audience by reporting back to the constituencies they represent. While the Working Group will have no decision-making authority, it provides a venue for regular communication with the public throughout the environmental review process. All meetings will be open to the public, and meeting summaries will be documented. The Working Group Charter and Summary of Activities are attached as Appendix B.

The Working Group will be composed of members representing key stakeholder groups, and members will be identified through a nomination process. A sample application form is attached as Appendix C. Nominations will be sought from groups in specific categories. In addition, individual nominations can be submitted to SANDAG. A SANDAG committee composed of two members of the Transportation Committee and SANDAG staff will select members from the nominations received based on a number of criteria, including regional representation, community served and the commitment to regularly attend meetings.

Table 4-1 summarizes the proposed membership categories and the number of Working Group seats in each category. The number of seats for each member category was chosen to provide balanced representation from the various entities and organizations in the corridor. It is recommended that the chair of the Working Group be an elected official and co-chair be a Working Group member. The chair will be selected by the SANDAG Board Chair and the Working Group co-chair will be selected by the Working Group participants. To ensure continuity, Working Group participants will be asked to commit to attend meetings throughout the environmental review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access advocate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community representatives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prepare Draft Notice of Preparation Distribution List
SANDAG will prepare a comprehensive distribution list for the draft Notice of Preparation. This list will include community groups, business organizations, environmental groups, transportation advocates, accessibility advocates, and residents, businesses, schools, churches, and community facilities in the corridor. Public agencies that have an interest in the project will also be included on the distribution list, as outlined in the Agency Coordination Plan. This list also will be used for distribution of future notices related to the environmental review process (i.e., Notice of Availability of the Draft SEIS/SEIR).

Make advance preparations to conduct scoping meetings
SANDAG will make all advance preparations to conduct four Scoping meetings in various locations along the corridor (Downtown San Diego, Old Town/Morena, Clairemont, University City/Golden Triangle). All meetings will be scheduled in locations that meet ADA requirements and are accessible by transit. Meetings will be scheduled at various times of the day to maximize opportunities for public participation.

4.3.2 Public Involvement During Scoping

The process of determining the focus and content of the SEIR/SEIS is known as environmental scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the Proposed Project. The scoping process is not intended to resolve differences of opinion regarding the Proposed Project or evaluate its merits. Instead, the process allows the public to express their concerns regarding the Proposed Project and thereby provides an opportunity for input to the environmental analysis. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, relevant Federal, State, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding alternatives to carry forward for environmental review and the range of environmental issues to be analyzed in the SEIR/SEIS.

A number of efforts will be implemented during this period to expand communication about the project:

- Provide public notice of the Scoping period
  The public will be provided notice of the commencement of the 30-day Scoping period, opportunities for providing public comment and dates and locations of Scoping meetings in the following ways:

  - Public notices will run in local publications
  - The Notice of Preparation will be mailed to the individuals and organizations on the distribution list and sent to the State Clearinghouse
  - Notices/invitations will be prepared to distribute to stakeholder groups in the corridor so that they can share the information with their members
- A news release will be prepared and distributed to the San Diego Union-Tribune, community newspapers and ethnic media outlets (as detailed in the media list attached as Appendix D)

- **Make Scoping Documents Available to the Public**
  The Notice of Preparation, Draft Public Involvement Plan, Draft Purpose and Need statement and information about the evaluation of alternatives (including those eliminated from further analysis) will be made available to the public during the Scoping period. These documents will be posted on the project Web site and made available at other public venues (SANDAG offices and public libraries in the corridor) at the commencement of the Scoping period to allow the public the opportunity to review them and provide comments during the Scoping period. Public information documents such as fact sheets, advertisements, and presentation materials will be prepared in English and Spanish.

- **Schedule and conduct briefings with media**
  To promote awareness among the media and foster accurate news coverage, one-on-one briefings with reporters covering the project will be conducted at the beginning of the Scoping period. Reporters will be briefed on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project and provided an overview of the project development milestones. A media kit also will be provided to each of the reporters.

- **Issue first Mid-Coast e-blast**
  A Mid-Coast e-blast will be kicked-off to provide a regular vehicle for sharing new information about the project. This first issue will be distributed following the Board of Directors decision on alternatives to take into scoping and will focus on introducing the project, announcing the commencement of the Scoping period, schedule of Scoping meetings, and providing information about opportunities to provide public input on project alternatives, the scope of the environmental document and the Public Involvement Plan.

- **Provide news updates for rEgion and other newsletters**
  A number of organizations along the Mid-Coast Corridor publish newsletters to keep their constituencies informed about issues of interest. Regular news updates about the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will be provided for publication in these organizational newsletters. Examples of newsletters to target are rEgion (SANDAG’s electronic newsletter) and publications of homeowners associations, churches, community groups and others. The first of regular news updates will be prepared during this stage to provide an introduction to the project, announce the commencement of the Scoping period, schedule of Scoping meetings, and information about opportunities to provide public input.

- **Conduct Scoping meetings**
  SANDAG will conduct five Scoping meetings to provide information about the Project Alternatives, Purpose and Need for the project and the environmental review process. Scoping also provides an opportunity for public input on the identification of issues to be studied in the Draft SEIR. The meetings will be held in communities along the Mid-Coast Corridor: Downtown San Diego, Old Town/Morena, Clairemont, UCSD, and University City/Golden Triangle. Comment cards and a court reporter will be used at each meeting to formally record comments. All comments will be collected following the meetings and catalogued for inclusion in the Scoping summary report. SANDAG will establish protocol for how meetings, comments, and contacts are to be recorded.
• Prepare Scoping summary report
   At the conclusion of all Scoping meetings, a report including all comments received at the meetings will be prepared. Comments received will be used by SANDAG to help determine the scope of the environmental review and alternatives to be studied. This report will be made available to the public so they can review the extent of all public comments received.

A report also will be prepared with comments received on the Draft Public Involvement Plan. This summary of comments received will be used by SANDAG to update the Public Involvement Plan. This report, including responses to comments, will be made available to the public so they can be made aware about how their comments were addressed in the Public Involvement Plan. The Public Involvement Plan will be updated as needed to respond to comments received.

4.3.3 Public Involvement Prior to Circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR

After completion of the Scoping period, SANDAG will decide which alternatives to carry forward for detailed environmental review and will initiate the preparation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. It also is anticipated that Preliminary Engineering on the project will begin during this period.

Public Involvement efforts will focus on continued work with the Working Group, as well as efforts to communicate information about the project through community organizations and events. The following tactics will be employed during this stage to continue working with the public:

• Update Informational Materials
   All project informational materials will be updated to reflect any new or changed information resulting from the Scoping period. This will include updates to the project fact sheet, Frequently Asked Questions, Web site, multimedia presentation and any other materials that provide project information.

• Continue working with Working Group
   Meetings will be held as needed to update the Working Group.

• Begin Speakers Bureau program
   To keep the local community and larger regional interests informed about the project throughout the process, a speakers bureau will be established to provide presentations to interested organizations. These presentations will serve to share information about the project and the planning and development process.

Groups that will be approached for presentations include, but are not limited to (specific stakeholders in each category are listed in Appendix A):
- Community planning groups
- Community and town councils
- Business organizations (e.g., San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, Golden Triangle Chamber of Commerce)
- UCSD campus groups
- Major employers
- Transportation Advocates (e.g., Move San Diego, San Diego Bicycle Coalition)
- Environmental groups (e.g., Sierra Club, San Diego River Coalition)
- Local schools
- Area churches
- Others as identified

The schedule of presentations will be recorded in the Public Involvement Contacts Database. The Contacts Database will include the date, time, place, presenter, and audience of each presentation. SANDAG will proactively seek to make presentations to interested organizations in the corridor. SANDAG also will make presentations upon request from members of the community.

- **Participate in community events**
  To reach a wider audience, project information will be provided and community input sought through participation in community events and festivals. These events may be sponsored by community groups, or could be targeted toward a specific audience, i.e., minority groups. A portable informational booth will be taken to various festivals, street fairs, etc., to share information about the project and its benefits to the Mid-Coast Corridor and the San Diego region and seek feedback from members of the public through comment cards, surveys and other means. These events also will provide an opportunity for event attendees to opt into the Mid-Coast e-blast list. In addition to community events, the portable information booth can be used at Westfield UTC and other community gathering places. The information booth will be staffed by members of the speakers bureau and/or appropriate SANDAG staff and consultant team members. All events will be recorded in the Public Involvement Contacts Database.

- **Seek locations to display project information**
  SANDAG will seek locations in the Mid-Coast Corridor that are willing to allow the placement of project information displays to reach a wide audience with project information. Attractive table-top displays will be created that contain project brochures and other useful information for the general public. The following locations will be targeted to display project information:
  - Westfield UTC
  - Costa Verde Shopping Center
  - La Jolla Village Square
  - Scripps Memorial Hospital La Jolla
  - VA Medical Center
  - UCSD Thornton Hospital
  - UCSD
  - Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center
  - Transit vehicles and transit centers
  - Libraries within the Corridor
  - Others, as deemed appropriate

- **Continue Mid-Coast e-blast**
  SANDAG will continue to write and distribute the Mid-Coast Corridor e-blast on a regular basis to provide a regular source of updated project information.

- **Continue regular news updates**
  SANDAG will continue to provide news updates for rEgion and other relevant newsletters in the Mid-Coast Corridor to report newsworthy information.

- **Update Informational Materials**
  All project informational materials will be updated to reflect any updated or changed information that occurred during the preparation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. This will include
updates to the project fact sheet, Frequently Asked Questions, Web site, multimedia presentation and any other materials that provide project information.

- **Update distribution list for Notice of Availability of Draft SEIS/SEIR**
  SANDAG will update the distribution list for the Notice of Availability of the Draft SEIS/SEIR to include all those who participated in the Scoping process and/or who have indicated that they would like to be added to the distribution list.

- **Make advance preparations to conduct public hearings/meetings for the Draft SEIS/SEIR**
  SANDAG will make all advance preparations to conduct four public hearings/meetings in various locations along the corridor (Downtown San Diego, Old Town/Morena, Clairemont, University City/Triangle). All meetings will be scheduled in locations that meet ADA requirements and are accessible by transit. Meetings will be scheduled at various times of the day to maximize opportunities for public participation.

### 4.3.4 Public Involvement During Draft SEIS/SEIR Public Review

The release of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for public review and comment marks the beginning of a 45-day period where the public is provided the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR. SANDAG will make efforts during this period to ensure that the public is aware of opportunities to comment and also to continue to convey project information to a broad audience throughout the corridor and region.

The following efforts will be implemented during this period to expand and continue communication about the project:

- **Public notice of the Draft SEIS/SEIR public comment period**
  The public will be provided notice of the availability of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, opportunities for providing public comment and dates and locations of public hearings/meetings in the following ways:

  - The Notice of Availability will be sent to the Federal Register, the State Clearinghouse, and the County Clerk’s office
  - Public notices will run in local publications
  - Notices of Availability will be mailed to the individuals and organizations on the distribution list, including all adjacent property owners along the project corridor
  - Notices/invitations will be prepared to distribute to stakeholder groups in the corridor so that they can share the information with their members
  - Notice will be provided on the project Web site
  - A news release will be prepared and distributed to the *San Diego Union-Tribune*, community newspapers and ethnic media outlets (as detailed in the media list attached as Appendix D)

- **Make the Draft SEIS/SEIR Available to the Public**
  The Draft SEIS/SEIR will be made available to the public for review and comment during the 45-day public review period. This document will be posted on the project Web site and made available at other public venues (SANDAG offices and public libraries in the corridor) at the commencement of the public review period to allow the public the opportunity to review it and provide comments during the public review period. CDs of the Draft SEIS/SEIR will be available upon request.
• Schedule and conduct briefings with reporters
  SANDAG will schedule and conduct one-on-one briefings with reporters covering the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project to provide information about the Draft SEIS/SEIR and the public review process. Reporters will be briefed on the findings of the environmental document, and any significant mitigation measures that may be proposed as a result of the project.

• Continue Mid-Coast e-blast
  SANDAG will continue to write and distribute the Mid-Coast Corridor e-blast on a regular basis to provide a regular source of updated project information, including the release of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for public review, schedule of public hearings/meetings and information about other opportunities to provide public input.

• Continue regular news updates
  SANDAG will continue to provide news updates for rEgion and other relevant newsletters in the Mid-Coast corridor to report newsworthy information, including the release of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for public review, schedule of public hearings/meetings and information about other opportunities to provide public input.

• Conduct public hearings/meetings
  Four public hearings/meetings will be conducted to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to learn more about the Draft SEIS/SEIR and provide public comment. These meetings will be held in Downtown San Diego, Old Town/Morena, Clairemont and University City/Golden Triangle. Comment cards and a court reporter will be used to formally record comments received.

• Prepare public hearing/meeting summary report
  At the conclusion of the Draft SEIS/SEIR public review period, a summary report of all comments received at the meetings will be prepared. This report will include a record of all comments received at the public hearings/meetings and by direct mail to SANDAG and will be responded to by SANDAG in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The public will be informed that the final public comment report has been published and it will be made available upon request and posted on the project Web site so they can review the extent of public comments received. It will also serve as a resource for decision makers so they are aware of issues raised by the public during the environmental review process.

• Continue working with Working Group
  Meetings will be held as needed to update the Working Group.

• Continue Speakers Bureau program
  SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to present project information to interested community and regional organizations. Speaking engagements will be tracked in the Public Involvement Contacts Database and will include information about presentation date, time, presenter, audience and comments received.

• Continue to participate in community events
  SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to participate in community events throughout the corridor.

• Provided updated information for display at public locations
  SANDAG will provide updated project information at all locations where project information displays are located.
4.3.5 Public Involvement Leading up to the Certification/Approval of the Final SEIS/SEIR and Record of Decision

During the stage when SANDAG is responding to comments made on the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the following activities will be conducted:

- **Prepare the Public Involvement Section for the Final SEIS/SEIR**
  SANDAG will draft a Public Involvement section for inclusion in the Final SEIS/SEIR. This section will include a summary of all efforts made to involve the public during the development of the environmental document.

- **Continue working with Working Group**
  Meetings with the Working Group will continue throughout this stage, as needed, and at a frequency determined by SANDAG in conjunction with the Working Group.

- **Continue Speakers Bureau program**
  SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to present project information to interested community and regional organizations. A record of these presentations will be maintained that will include information about presentation date, time, presenter, and audience.

- **Continue to participate in community events**
  SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to participate in community events throughout the Corridor.

- **Continue Mid-Coast e-blast**
  SANDAG will continue to write and distribute the Mid-Coast Corridor e-blast on a regular basis to provide a regular source of updated project information.

- **Continue regular news updates**
  SANDAG will continue to provide news updates for rEgion and other relevant newsletters in the Mid-Coast corridor to report newsworthy information.

- **Update Informational Materials**
  All project informational materials will be updated to reflect any updated or changed information that occurred as a result of the response to comments made on the Draft SEIS/SEIR. This will include updates to the project fact sheet, Frequently Asked Questions, Web site, multimedia presentation and any other materials that provide project information.

- **Update distribution list for Notice of Availability of Final SEIS/SEIR**
  SANDAG will update the distribution list for the Notice of Availability of the Final SEIS/SEIR to include all those who participated in the public review of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and/or who indicated that they would like to be added to the distribution list.

- **Public notice of the availability of the Final SEIS/SEIR**
  The release of the Final SEIS/SEIR is the final step before the SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to certify the Final SEIR and the FTA will be asked to issue a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final SEIS. The public will be provided notice of the availability of the Final SEIS/SEIR in the following ways:

  - A Notice of Availability of the Final SEIS will be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Federal Activities for publication in the Federal Register.
Public notices will run in local publications
- Notices of Availability will be mailed to the individuals and organizations on the
distribution list
- Notices will be prepared to distribute to stakeholder groups in the corridor so that
they can share the information with their members
- Notice will be provided on the project Web site
- A news release will be prepared and distributed to the San Diego Union-Tribune,
community newspapers and ethnic media outlets (as detailed in the media list
attached as Appendix D)

- Schedule and conduct briefings with reporters
SANDAG will schedule and conduct one-on-one briefings with reporters covering the
project to provide information about the Final SEIS/SEIR and the remaining steps until
the document is certified by the SANDAG Board and a Record of Decision is issued by
the FTA. Reporters will be briefed on responses provided to significant public comments,
the expected timeline for certification and approval of the document and the next steps in
the project development process.

- Continue Speakers Bureau program
SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to present project information to interested
community and regional organizations. A record of these presentations will be maintained
that will include information about presentation date, time, presenter, and audience.

- Continue to participate in community events
SANDAG will continue to seek opportunities to participate in community events
throughout the Corridor.

- Provide updated information for display at public locations
SANDAG will provide updated project information at all locations where project
information displays are located.

- Continue Mid-Coast e-blast
SANDAG will continue to write and distribute the Mid-Coast Corridor e-blast on a regular
basis to provide a regular source of updated project information.

- Continue regular news updates
SANDAG will continue to provide news updates for rEgion and other relevant newsletters
in the Mid-Coast corridor to report newsworthy information.

4.3.6 Public Involvement Subsequent to the Record of Decision

After SANDAG certifies the Final SEIR and adopts the Findings of Effect and Mitigation
Monitoring and Reporting Plan, the Board can approve the project. The FTA will issue a
Record of Decision on the Final SEIS 45 days after the Federal Register notice of the
availability of the Final SEIS. SANDAG will notify the public of the decisions and provide
information about the next steps in the process (Final Design, leading eventually to
Construction) in the following manner:

- Issue news release announcing the certification of the Final SEIR and FTA’s Record of
  Decision on the Final SEIS
SANDAG will issue a news release to the appropriate media outlets, including ethnic
media, announcing the certification of the Final SEIR, and project approval and Record of
Decision on the Final SEIS. The news release will include information about the approved project and the next steps in the project development and public involvement processes.

- **Final Mid-Coast e-blast (for this phase)**
  SANDAG will issue the final Mid-Coast e-blast for the Environmental/Preliminary Engineering stage. The e-blast will focus on the certification of the Final SEIR and Record of Decision on the Final SEIS, and the next steps in the project development and public involvement processes.

- **Final news update (for this phase)**
  A final news update for the Environmental/Preliminary Engineering stage will be issued to provide information about the certification of the Final SEIR and Record of Decision on the Final SEIS, and next steps in the project development and public involvement process. This news update will be used for an article in rEGion and other relevant newsletters in the Mid-Coast Corridor.

- **Update informational materials**
  Informational materials for the project will be updated to reflect the certification of the Final SEIR and Record of Decision of the Final SEIS. These materials include the Web site, fact sheet, Frequently Asked Question and multimedia presentation.

- **Provided updated information for display at public locations**
  SANDAG will provide updated project information at all locations where project information displays are located.

### 4.3.7 Plan Assessment

In order to assess the effectiveness of the public involvement efforts, SANDAG will assess the effectiveness of the Public Involvement Plan at key milestones in the project development process. These reports will help SANDAG to evaluate public involvement strategies and tactics and make adjustments along the way, and will inform future public involvement outreach phases of the Mid-Coast Transit Corridor project.

These reports will include:

- A summary of all outreach efforts and input received
- A qualitative assessment of how effective the efforts to obtain input were, i.e., audiences reached, level of agreement on project issues, input incorporated into project design
- A quantitative assessment of the public involvement plan including the number of meetings/presentations/events participated in, Web site hits, approximate number of people reached, number of comments received, and number of media contacts along with the resulting media coverage
- The Public Involvement Plan will be revised and strategies/tactics adjusted based on assessments at key milestones
### MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT

#### STAKEHOLDERS LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Advocates</td>
<td>AARP San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Advocates</td>
<td>Access to Independence of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Advocates</td>
<td>City of San Diego Disabled Services Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Biocom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Building Owners and Managers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Discover Pacific Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Golden Triangle Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Greater Clairemont Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Old Town San Diego Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>Promote La Jolla Inc. BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>San Diego BID Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>San Diego Coastal Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>San Diego North Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Groups</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>La Jolla Golden Triangle Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>Linda Vista Civic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>Linda Vista Community Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>Mission Bay Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>Old Mission Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>University City Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Associations</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Balboa Avenue Citizens Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Carmel Valley Community Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Centre City Advisory Committee (CCAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Clairemont Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Clairemont Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>La Jolla Shores Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>La Jolla Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Linda Vista Community Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Little Italy Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Little Italy Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Midway Community Planning Advisory Committee (North Bay Planning Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Mission Beach Precise Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Mission Beach Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Mission Valley Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>North Bay Redevelopment PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Old Town Community Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Community Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Torrey Hills Community Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Torrey Pines Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>UC Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>University City Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>University City Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>All Saints Lutheran Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Braille Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Church of the Good Samaritan Episcopal School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Congregation Adat Yeshurun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Curie Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Doyle Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>La Jolla Country Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>La Jolla Country Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Lawrence Jewish Family Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Mission Bay Montessori Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>San Diego California Temple - Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Spreckles Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>St Anthony Antiochian Orthodox Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Standley Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Torrey Pines Christian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Torrey Pines Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>University City High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>University City United Church of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>University Lutheran Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>University Lutheran Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Biogen IDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Costco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Evans Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Genesee Executive Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>La Jolla Hyatt at Aventine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>La Jolla Spine Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Professional Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Ligand Pharmaceuticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Nobel Corporate Plaza Center / Equity Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Pfizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Sheraton La Jolla (formerly Radisson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Regents Square Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Residence Inn by Marriott - La Jolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>San Diego Sports Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Scripps Memorial Hospital La Jolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>SeaWorld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Skye Pharmaceuticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>UCSD, Thornton Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Veteran Affairs San Diego Healthcare System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Association of Environmental Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>California Coastal Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society San Diego (CNPSSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Environmental Health Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Friends of Rose Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Friends of Tecolote Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Friends of the San Diego River Mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>I Love A Clean San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Industrial Environmental Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>League of Conservation Voters, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Rose Creek Watershed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Archaeological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Canyonlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Coastkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego River Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego River Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Southwest Wetlands Interpretative Association (SWIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Org.</td>
<td>Surfrider, San Diego Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>MCAS Miramar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>Asian Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>The Urban Land Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>NAIOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>Building Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>San Diego Housing Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>Bayside Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce of San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>MAAC Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>San Diego County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Organizing Project (SDOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Urban League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Org.</td>
<td>San Diego Workforce Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Committee</td>
<td>Marian Bear Memorial Park Recreation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Committee</td>
<td>Mission Bay Park Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Committee</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Recreation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Committee</td>
<td>Tecolote Canyon CAC (Citizen’s Advisory Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Andria HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Avanti HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Cambridge Park Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Capri HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Casa Bella HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Canyon Park Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Costa Verde Apartments - North and South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Costa Verde Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Garden Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Florentine HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Jolla Canyon Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Jolla Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Jolla Crossroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Jolla International Garden Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Jolla Vista Townhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>La Scala Luxury Villas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Lucera at University Towne Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Pacific Garden Apartments - UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Playmor Terrace West Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Regency Villas Senior Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Regents Court La Jolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Renaissance La Jolla Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Southcoast Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>The Villas of Renaissance Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Toscana HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Trieste Apartment Villas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>University Towne Square Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Valenta HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Venetian Condominiums Homeowners Association/ JJJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Villa Vicenza Condominiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Village Apartments on the Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Villas HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods/Residential</td>
<td>Windemere Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Retail</td>
<td>Costa Verde Shopping Center/ Regency Property Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Retail</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Square Shopping Center - Madison Marquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Retail</td>
<td>Renaissance Towne Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Retail</td>
<td>Westfield Shoppingtown, University Towne Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>UCSD Associate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>UCSD Graduate Student Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>USD Associate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayer Advocate</td>
<td>San Diego County Taxpayers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>San Diego Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>San Diego Convention Center Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>COMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>La Jolla Traffic &amp; Transportation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>Move San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>San Diego Bicycle Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>Transit Alliance for a Better North County (TABNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advocate</td>
<td>Walk San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charter for Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group

Purpose
The purpose of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group (PWG) is to receive information from SANDAG about the project and provide input into key activities associated with the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The PWG will lay the foundation for public involvement in future phases of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project’s implementation.

Line of Reporting
The PWG will provide input to SANDAG staff on specific activities related to the development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, as discussed in the next section. Staff will consider input from the PWG in making recommendations to the Transportation Committee. The SANDAG Board will make final decisions on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, its components, and the certification of the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

Responsibilities
The PWG will review the project purpose and need, consideration of alternatives for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, and the Public Involvement Plan. The PWG will have an opportunity to review and comment on the public Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)/SEIR, including impacts and mitigation measures, when it is available. The information that will be presented to the PWG includes, but is not limited to, the draft Public Involvement Plan, Federal Transit Administration evaluation criteria and review process, and SANDAG evaluation of various alternatives. The PWG also will assist with associated public outreach and help inform and encourage active public participation by outside groups with which they are affiliated. The PWG will provide input to SANDAG staff and the Transportation Committee.

Membership
The PWG will have up to 23 members, representing the geographic areas of the corridor and the diverse perspectives of stakeholders interested in the project. The primary membership, as well as a membership waiting list, will be approved by the SANDAG Board. The members are selected based on the review of applications submitted to SANDAG that assessed their qualifications and affiliations with representative organizations and interests in the Mid-Coast Corridor. Members do not have alternates. If a member misses three meetings in a row or four meetings over the course of one year, s/he will be replaced.

In the event that any members need to be replaced, new members will be selected from the approved waiting list by a majority vote of the PWG.

Meeting Time and Location
The PWG will meet on a monthly basis, or as determined by the members of the PWG, in coordination with SANDAG staff. Meetings typically will be held on the first Wednesday of the month from 3:30 to 5 p.m. at the SANDAG offices at 401 B Street in San Diego. The PWG will hold some of its meetings at other locations in the corridor.

Working Group Leadership
The Chair of the PWG is appointed by the Chair of the SANDAG Board. The PWG will elect a Vice Chair from its membership by a majority vote.

Duration of Existence
The PWG will complete its work with the certification of the SEIR by the SANDAG Board and the approval of the SEIS by the FTA (anticipated in summer 2011).

Brown Act and Conflict Of Interest
Consistent with Government Code Section 54952(b), the PWG is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act.
Public Involvement Plan
In accordance with state and federal guidelines, a draft Public Involvement Plan has been prepared to actively involve the public in the planning and development process for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. There will be a series of public meetings and other means for involving the public by providing information on the project and receiving input at key milestones in the planning and development process for the project. The PWG will be asked to review and provide input on the draft plan to ensure that it effectively provides opportunities to involve the public in the process.

Review Draft Purpose and Need Statement
A draft Purpose and Need Statement has been prepared by SANDAG for presentation at the SEIS Scoping meetings. This statement will be provided to the PWG at the initial meeting. Any comments from PWG members or from the Group would need to be submitted at the official Scoping meetings.

Review of Alternatives Evaluation
SANDAG is currently in the process of evaluating a number of project alternatives for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. These alternatives are being evaluated against FTA cost effectiveness criteria defined in the New Starts Program. SANDAG will provide information to the PWG on the various alternatives under evaluation to fully understand how alternatives were evaluated and screened from further consideration.

Review of environmental findings and proposed mitigation
SANDAG will begin the environmental review process for the project with the initiation of project scoping in Spring 2010 and will prepare a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) over the following year. Information regarding the scope of the Draft SEIS/SEIR and methods of analysis will be shared with the PWG during the development of the SEIR/SEIS and comments from the PWG will be made after the public Draft SEIR/SEIS is available for review.
APPLICATION FORM FOR THE SANDAG
2009-2011 MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT WORKING GROUP
(due June 22, 2009)

Name: _____________________________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________________

Phone: _____________________________________________________________________________

E-mail: _____________________________________________________________________________

Return to:
Anne Steinberger, Marketing Manager
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B St., Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
ast@sandag.org
(619) 699-1937

Please check the membership category you are applying for (please check all that apply):

☐ Access advocate
☐ Business community
☐ Community representative
☐ Community services (schools, churches, community facilities)
☐ Employer
☐ Environmental
☐ Retail
☐ Student
☐ Taxpayer advocate
☐ Transportation advocate
☐ Transit rider
☐ At-large member (resident or business owner in the Mid-Coast Corridor)

Please answer the following questions:

(Please make responses as concise as possible; applications will not be judged on length of response)
1. Why are you interested in serving on the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group?

2. What skills and abilities would you bring to the Project Working Group?
3. Which of the following topics are of most interest to you as they relate to the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project? (please select no more than two)

- Environmental review
- Alternatives evaluation
- Design elements
- Community impacts
- Social Equity & Environmental Justice
- Other

4. Have you participated in any activities related to the areas of interest selected in Question 3? If so, briefly describe the activity/ies.

5. What would you hope to accomplish by your participation?

6. What ZIP code(s) do you work in and/or live in?

7. List any civic organizations to which you belong now, or have in the past.

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group will meet the first Wednesday of each month from 3:30 to 5 p.m. at the SANDAG offices in downtown San Diego. Members of the working group will be replaced if they miss three consecutive meetings or five over the course of one year. Please only apply if you can make this commitment to the process.
## MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT
### MEDIA LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>KPBS FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Journal</td>
<td>KPBS TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach &amp; Bay Press</td>
<td>KUSI TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese News</td>
<td>La Jolla Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairemont Community News</td>
<td>La Jolla Village News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast News</td>
<td>La Prensa San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Sun</td>
<td>North County Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor News</td>
<td>Peninsula Beacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTN County Television Network</td>
<td>Philippine Mabuhay News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox 5 News / KSWB</td>
<td>Philippines Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Transcript, The</td>
<td>Pomerado Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Times</td>
<td>Presidio Sentinel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Village Voice</td>
<td>San Diego Business Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Gateway Signature</td>
<td>San Diego City Beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diario San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego Community Newspaper Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Californian</td>
<td>San Diego Ranch Coast Newspaper Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Latino</td>
<td>San Diego Downtown News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlace</td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino Press</td>
<td>San Diego Newsline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanos Unidos</td>
<td>San Diego Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach Eagle &amp; Times</td>
<td>San Diego Union-Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBNT TV Channel 17</td>
<td>San Diego Voice &amp; Viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFMB TV</td>
<td>Star News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGTVC Channel 10</td>
<td>Tieng Viet San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNSD TV (NBC 7/39)</td>
<td>Voice of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOGO AM</td>
<td>XETV 6 The CW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT
### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Beck, UCPG</td>
<td>Can SANDAG create a shorter “Cliff’s Notes” version of the plan that is easier for the public to understand?</td>
<td>SANDAG prepared a summary of the elements of the Public Involvement Plan for public distribution during scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.</td>
<td>The mission statement or objective of the plan should be more prominently displayed in the document.</td>
<td>The goals/purpose of the Public Involvement Plan are currently outlined in Section 1.3; however a brief sentence referencing the goals/purpose will also be added to the Introduction, Section 1.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anette Blatt, Scripps Health</td>
<td>I would like more information presented about the structure of the speakers’ bureau.</td>
<td>This comment has been noted and information on how to schedule presentations will be posted on the Mid-Coast Web site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>Mission Valley Community Planning Group should be added as a stakeholder.</td>
<td>The Mission Valley Community Planning Group was added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 27, under “Community Groups”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>The Mission Bay Park Committee should also be added as a stakeholder.</td>
<td>Mission Bay Park Committee was included among the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 29, under “Park Committee”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Westling, UCSD Student</td>
<td>UCSD graduate student government should be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>UCSD Graduate Student Government was added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 30 under “Students”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Westling, UCSD Student</td>
<td>USD should also be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>USD was added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Employers”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
<td>The scoping comment period should be extended to 60 days from the required 30 days.</td>
<td>A formal request to extend the Scoping period should be made to the SANDAG Executive Director/Chairman of Transportation Committee/Chairman of the SANDAG Board in advance of scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
<td>The comment period for the draft EIR should also be extended from the required 45 days to 60 days.</td>
<td>A formal request to extend the Scoping period should be made to the SANDAG Executive Director/Chairman of Transportation Committee/Chairman of the SANDAG Board in advance of scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
<td>The results of the alternatives evaluation should be made available to the public and 60-day public comment period should be provided.</td>
<td>Information on the alternatives evaluation will be presented and available for comment during the scoping process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Knight, Friends of Rose Canyon</td>
<td>The Rose Creek Watershed Alliance and the Friends of Rose Creek should be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>Rose Creek Watershed Alliance and Friends of Rose Creek have been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Environmental Org.”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage, Inc.</td>
<td>The purpose of the project and what is driving it should be made clear.</td>
<td>This will be addressed in the Statement of Purpose &amp; Need and will be available for review and comment during the Scoping period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lani Lutar, San Diego County Taxpayers Association</td>
<td>The results of the alternatives evaluation should be presented objectively.</td>
<td>This comment has been noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Peterson, Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee</td>
<td>Add Clairemont News to the list of media publications.</td>
<td>Clairemont News has been added to the list of media publications in Appendix D, beginning on page 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>Property owners along the selected alternative should be notified of the project.</td>
<td>This comment has been noted. Notification procedures are outlined on page 17, under Section 4.3.2, and will meet all necessary noticing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Fitchitt, Westfield Corporation</td>
<td>The Urban Land Institute, NAIOP, Building Industry Association and San Diego Housing Federation should be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>The Urban Land Institute, NAIOP and Building Industry Association and San Diego Housing Federation have been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Interest Groups”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
<td>The Pacific Beach Planning Group and La Jolla Community Planning Association should be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Planning Group and La Jolla Community Planning Association have been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on pages 26 and 27, under “Community Groups”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
<td>Libraries within the Corridor should be added as places to post public information about the project.</td>
<td>“Libraries within the Corridor” has been added on page 18, under the 2nd bullet point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe LaCava, La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
<td>The title of section 3 should be changed from “Key Information About the Project” to “Goals for the Project.”</td>
<td>The first two bullets of Section 3.0 on page 11 are more goal-oriented but the last three bullets are more factual in nature. The title of Section 3.0 has been revised to “Key Information and Goals for the Project”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>Mission Valley Community Planning Group should be added to the list of stakeholders</td>
<td>Mission Valley Community Planning Group has been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 26, under “Community Groups”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Allen, La Jolla Resident</td>
<td>Several of the employers listed in the Corridor are outside of the Corridor. SANDAG should consider whether these employers would really be users of the system if they are so far away.</td>
<td>This comment has been noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan McLaughlin, San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council</td>
<td>The requirements of CEQA should be clearly stated in the plan.</td>
<td>A list of federal/state requirements for public involvement under both NEPA/CEQA are outlined on page 6, under Section 1.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan McLaughlin, San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council</td>
<td>Employee groups (labor unions) should be added to the list of stakeholders, since many of these people will be the ones using the transit system.</td>
<td>San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council has been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Labor”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Allen, La Jolla Resident</td>
<td>In Section 3, La Jolla should be listed as a “Visitor Serving Center.”</td>
<td>La Jolla has been added to the list of area attractions under the first bullet point on page 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>The Sports Arena should be added to the list of stakeholders.</td>
<td>The San Diego Sports Arena has been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Employers”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe La Cava, La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
<td>Some thought should be given to how you will assess the effectiveness of the plan.</td>
<td>On page 25, Section 4.3.7, outlines the measures necessary to gauge the effectiveness of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>In Appendix B, the times of the Project Working Group meetings are listed incorrectly.</td>
<td>The frequency of the Project Working Group meetings has been corrected to 1st Wednesday of the month at 3:30 p.m. in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>Should the Coastal Commission be listed as a stakeholder in the document?</td>
<td>This comment has been noted and this will be addressed in a separate Agency Coordination Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>On Page 11, UCSD’s student population should be listed as 28,000.</td>
<td>The figure for UCSD’s student population has been corrected to 28,000 on page 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>On page 14, you mention that you would like to achieve a 10 percent increase in Web site hits. It would be helpful to know the baseline figure.</td>
<td>This comment has been noted and SANDAG will add the baseline figure of 2,380 for Web site hits on page 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>MCAS Miramar should be added to the stakeholder list.</td>
<td>MCAS Miramar has been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Military”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>On Page 17, UCSD and UCSD Thornton Hospital should be listed separately.</td>
<td>UCSD and UCSD Thornton Hospital have been listed separately, on page 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Gregory, UCSD</td>
<td>Under Employers, I would propose to standardize how UCSD is referenced, by eliminating UCSD, Government and Community Relations, Student Human Relations; add UCSD and leave remaining UCSD Thornton Hospital.</td>
<td>References to UCSD have been corrected in the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 28, under “Employers”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Beck, UCPG</td>
<td>Suggestion to add HOAs in La Jolla Colony: La Florentine, Casa Bella, Avanti, Toscana, Andria, Capri, Valentia, Villas</td>
<td>These HOAs have been added to the list of stakeholders in Appendix A, on page 29, under “Neighborhoods/Residential”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>