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Abstract

This document describes and summarizes the transportation impacts, environmental impacts and costs of the transit and highway improvement alternatives being considered for the Mid-Coast Corridor, in San Diego, California. The proposed action is an improvement to the transportation system in the coastal portion of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) area of jurisdiction between the community of Old Town and the northern boundary of the City of San Diego. Connections to other elements of the Metropolitan Transit System are included as part of the proposed action. MTDB intends to seek a federal transit grant to fund the selected locally preferred alternative. Caltrans would seek FHWA funding for the HOV Alternative as part of improving the Regional Transportation System.

Alternatives being considered include the No Build, Transportation System Management (TSM), TSM with improvements to the programmed Commuter Rail project, Commuter Rail Tunnel, HOV Lane, and light rail transit (LRT) on one of two LRT alignment options. The Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR) details the alignment concepts, with capital and operating costs, and considers their potential effects on transportation service, traffic, transit ridership, accessibility, neighborhoods, economic factors, natural resources, air quality, noise, parklands, historic sites, and financial feasibility. The information in the AA/DEIS/DEIR studies will be used by MTDB to select a locally preferred alternative for the Corridor, and for MTDB, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to make informed programming decisions.

This DEIS/DEIR is a necessary first step of a Final Environmental Document intended to cover state and local governmental approvals which may be needed to construct and implement a project.

There is a 60 day Public Review Period for this AA/DEIS/DEIR from March 10, 1995 to May 8, 1995. A Public Hearing and two Public Meetings will be held during April 1995 to receive comments prior to the development of the Final Environmental Document. Those persons unable to attend the meetings may submit written comments to Mr. Dennis Wahl, Project Manager, MTDB, 1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000, San Diego, CA 92101. The dates, times and locations of the public meetings are as follows:

**Public Meetings**

April 18, 1995  
La Jolla Village Square  
Community Room (next to AMC Theater)  
8657 Villa La Jolla Drive  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
7:00 PM to 9:00 PM

April 19, 1995  
Clairemont High School Cafeteria  
4150 Ute Drive  
San Diego, CA 92117  
7:00 PM to 9:00 PM

**Public Hearing**

April 27, 1995  
MTDB Board Meeting Room  
1255 Imperial Avenue, 10th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101  
9:00 AM
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FOREWORD

This Mid-Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR) is being carried out in accordance with regulations developed by the Council on Environmental Quality for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This document follows FTA's September 1986 Draft Procedures and Technical Methods for Transit Project Planning, as updated. The structure of this document is outlined in the Table of Contents. An index is also provided to facilitate the location of certain subjects.

This document also contains eight Appendices. Appendix A provides documentation of the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP), Appendix B provides a glossary of terms used in the AA/DEIS/DEIR, Appendix C provides a List of Preparers, Appendix D provides documentation of Coordination and Consultation information, Appendix E provides a list of AA/DEIS/DEIR recipients, Appendix F includes references used in the preparation of the AA/DEIS/DEIR (all of which are available at the Metropolitan Transit Development Board, 1255 Imperial Avenue, 10th floor, San Diego, CA). Appendix G contains the Section 4(f) evaluation, and Appendix H is a separately bound volume containing Plans and Profiles for the HOV and LRT Alternatives. Appendix I is the Caltrans Project Study Report, an engineering feasibility report detailing a Caltrans preferred Mid-Coast High-Occupancy-Vehicle (HOV) Alternative design. This report is provided under a separate cover and is available at the MTDB offices and at Caltrans, located at 2829 Juan Street, San Diego, CA.