APPENDIX A

Initial Study, Notice of Preparation (NOP), NOP Mailing List and Responses to NOP
October 25, 1990

Dear Interested Agency/Citizen:

Subject: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Enclosed is the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transportation issues from the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) analyzing transit alternatives being studied in the Mid-Coast Corridor from the San Diego River to Del Mar Heights Road in the Cities of San Diego and Del Mar. MTDB will be the Lead Agency for this project and will supervise the preparation of the document. We need to know your views or the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Please read the enclosed material carefully. Your agency may need to use the environmental document prepared by MTDB when considering your permit or the approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the probable environmental effects are contained in the enclosed materials. A copy of an Initial Study is enclosed.

Due to time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than November 26, 1990.

Please send your response including the name of the contact person in your agency to:

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Larwin
General Manager

TFL:1m - L-ISSUES.DJW

Enclosures: Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation Initial Study
TO: Interested Agency/Citizen

FROM: San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION WITH TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES AND PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (MTDB) REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM MID-COAST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

MTDB hereby presents notice that an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) will be prepared for the Mid-Coast Corridor of the regional light rail transit system pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.4. MTDB also presents notice of consultation with transportation planning agencies and public agencies which have transportation facilities within their jurisdiction that could be affected by this project, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21092.4.

BACKGROUND

MTDB, in cooperation with the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), is evaluating alternatives for improving mass transit services in the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor has been defined as extending from the area near the junction of Interstate 5 and Interstate 8, north along Interstate 5 to the vicinity of Del Mar Heights Road (See Map 1). This evaluation is being conducted as part of the MTDB program to develop and implement transit system improvements throughout the metropolitan service area.

Transit improvements are being proposed in the Mid-Coast Corridor to reduce transit travel times and thus, increase the availability of travel options for Mid-Coast residents to points elsewhere in the metropolitan service area, for jobs, education, medical, shopping, and cultural opportunities. Residents throughout the region would benefit from improved access and mobility in the corridor. Improved transit service could also provide opportunities for economic development in the Corridor consistent with adopted growth and infrastructure policies.

A Mid-Coast Corridor EIR/EIS/Alternatives Analysis will evaluate several improvement alternatives:

- **No-Build** – This alternative includes new transportation improvements which are programmed for construction within the next six years, including all TransNet Projects funded by the Proposition A local sales tax in 1987, and projects identified in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Major projects in the STIP within the I-5 corridor are Stage I of the I-5/SR-56 Interchange and three Interchange modifications in University City funded as Facility Benefit Assessment Projects.

- **TSM** – The Transportation Systems Management alternative includes increased transit services and facilities consisting of all projects from the No-Build alternative plus increased express and local bus service. Selected priority treatments (carpool/bus lanes) and new or expanded park-and-ride lots and transit centers are included.
• **HOV Lanes** – All projects from the TSM alternative plus High Occupancy Vehicle lanes on I-5 south of Del Mar Heights Road to the vicinity of I-5 will be included in this alternative. Some transit services would be realigned to utilize the HOV lanes.

• **LRT** – This alternative consists of Light Rail Transit along one or more alignments depending upon the results of screening during the EIR/EIS/AA process that may reduce the number of alignment options. The alignment options consist of:
  - South Segment: San Diego River to Gilman Drive
    - The alignment would run adjacent to the AT&SF railroad line
  - Center Segment: Gilman Drive to Genesee Avenue
    - Three alignment alternatives will be examined:
      1. Along Gilman Drive, through the University of California San Diego to run along I-5;
      2. Along I-5; and,
      3. Along the AT&SF rail line to Regents Road, then along Regents Road to Genesee Avenue before returning to I-5.
  - North Segment: Genesee Avenue to Del Mar Heights Road
    - The alignment would generally follow I-5.

Within the Center Segment, an east/west Spur is planned. The Spur will extend from the Mainline to provide service east through University City. One option ends the Spur west of I-805, while a second option continues the Spur over I-805 and then along Miramar Road to the vicinity of the proposed Miramar Commuter Rail Station.

The evaluation will be conducted in consultation with the City of San Diego and other local agencies, Caltrans and other State agencies, Federal agencies, interest groups, and the public.

**PROJECT LOCATION**

The attached maps show the following:

Map 1. San Diego region showing the Corridor study area and the location of presently operating and future proposed LRT lines.

Map 2. Alternative LRT alignments to be considered in the EIR/EIS.

**REQUESTS FOR RESPONSE TO THIS NOTICE**

MTDB requests comments from responsible agencies as to the scope and content of environmental information which is germane to that responsible agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project and which should be included in the environmental impact report.

MTDB also requests comments from transportation planning agencies and public agencies which have transportation facilities within their jurisdiction which could be affected by the project. This request for comments is for the purpose of obtaining information concerning the project's effect on major local arterial, public transit, freeways, highways and rail transit service within the jurisdiction of such agencies. This request for comments shall constitute the consultation required by Public Resources Code § 21092.4.

This notice should also serve to inform other interested parties of the initiation of the EIR/EIS.
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POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following checklist details the areas of probable environmental effect. After each series of checklist questions, there is a discussion of the environmental findings in relation to the project.
## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
### MID-COAST CORRIDOR

1. **EARTH.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

   b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      | (XX)| ( )   | ( )|

   c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

   d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

   e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

   f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in slitation, deposition, or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

   g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?  
      
      | Yes | Maybe | No |
      |-----|-------|----|
      |     | (XX)  | ( )|

Construction of any of the build alternatives would require grading which has the potential to disrupt the soil.

It is not anticipated that the proposed alternatives would cause or create unstable earth conditions; however, it is possible that such conditions may be encountered during construction. The alternatives being considered would not alter the underlying geologic structure, or destruct, cover, or modify any known unique geologic feature. Construction could affect soil erosion; however, the construction plans will include requirements to minimize these effects. The project boundary traverses the Rose Canyon Fault. Any alternative selected would be designed and constructed according to seismic requirements in order to protect property and minimize possible major geologic hazards.
2. **AIR.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   b. The creation of objectionable odors? ( ) (XX) ( )

   c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   d. Expose the project residents to severe air pollution conditions? ( ) ( ) (XX)

The alternatives under consideration should reduce the number of cars on the road, therefore overall ambient air quality should be improved. In general, there are no objectionable odors associated with the construction or operation of electrified LRT systems. Bus transit alternatives would operate on diesel power and increase the emissions of diesel fumes, particulates, and hydrocarbons. In localized areas where LRT stations are proposed, some microscale degradation of air quality could exist in the morning and afternoon peak hours due to automobiles entering/egressing park-and-ride/kiss-and-ride areas.

The project does not have the potential to alter movements of air, moisture, or temperature either locally or regionally.

3. **WATER.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface water runoff? ( ) (XX) ( )

   c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters? ( ) (XX) ( )

   d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body? ( ) (XX) ( )

   e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity? ( ) (XX) ( )

   f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water? ( ) (XX) ( )
g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

h. Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

i. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?

j. Significant changes in temperature, flow or chemical content of surface thermal springs?

Construction of the alternatives being considered has the potential to disrupt the flow rate and increase siltation in the San Diego River, Rose, San Clemente, Tecolote, and Penasquitos Creeks and other drainage ways in the Corridor vicinity, and possibly change the direction of water movements where turn radii need to be straightened to maximize train speeds. It is not anticipated that the alternatives will affect groundwater levels or the quality of groundwater resources. Some additional surface water runoff can be expected. The amount will depend on the alternatives selected and the size of the capital facilities, such as transit centers, park-and-ride lots, and LRT stations. A crossing of the San Diego River is necessary for the LRT alternatives. With the possible exception of flash flood areas, the project would not expose people to water related hazards. It is possible that the LRT alternatives could result in flood plain encroachment at floodway crossings. The amount of encroachment, if any, will be minimized through design of crossing structures. Specific drainage changes will be further investigated during the study process.

4. PLANT LIFE. Will the proposal result in:

a. Change in the diversity of species or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?

b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or result in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?

d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?

A large portion of the alignments being considered under the LRT alternative follow existing railroad and freeway right-of-way, and therefore it is not anticipated that construction of the alternatives in this area would affect the diversity or numbers of any species of plant. However, in areas where the LRT alignment deviates from the existing railroad and freeway right-of-way, the alternative alignments do traverse areas that are currently considered to be sensitive habitat, thus having the potential to change the
diversity or number of plant species. Reduction in the diversity or number of plant species could result in the reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species which may exist in the study vicinity. A biological resources study will be conducted to determine any impacts.

Construction and operation of LRT alternatives and stations could involve revegetation or landscaping, but it is not anticipated that the project will introduce any new species or plant into the area, or act as a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species. There is no agriculture in the area, and the project will not result in the reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop.

5. **ANIMAL LIFE.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Change in the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish, and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals? ( ) (XX) ( )

   c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat? ( ) (XX) ( )

Portions of the study area traverse identified sensitive habitat that could contain sensitive or endangered species. A biological assessment will be performed as part of the environmental process.

Construction and operation of any alternative being considered does not involve the introduction of animal species into an area or create a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.

6. **NOISE.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Increases in existing noise levels? (XX) ( ) ( )

   b. Exposures of people to severe noise levels? ( ) (XX) ( )

The construction of any alternative will increase existing noise levels in noise sensitive locations adjacent to the construction area. Operation of any alternative will increase existing noise levels at any given point along the alignment whenever a transit vehicle passes that location. A noise study will be conducted to determine if the operation of the transit alternatives are expected to expose people to severe noise levels and noise impacts. The Study also will propose mitigation measures if needed.
7. **LIGHT AND GLARE.** Will the proposal:

a. Produce new light or glare from street lights or other sources? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Reduce access to sunlight of adjacent properties due to shade and shadow. ( ) (XX) ( )

Lighting used in transit stations and parking areas can be designed in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts. Should the LRT be elevated in certain locations, shadows could cause some reduction in sunlight.

8. **LAND USE.** Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? ( ) (XX) ( )

Although some changes may be necessary to accommodate any alternative being considered, the project would not result in any substantial alteration to existing or planned land uses in the area.

9. **NATURAL RESOURCES.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable resources? ( ) ( ) (XX)

The implementation of any alternative will reduce the number of automobiles traveling the roads in the area and thus would reduce the amount of gasoline used.

10. **RISK OF UPSET.** Does the proposal involve:

a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? ( ) ( ) (XX)

The construction and operation of the alternatives being considered does not involve the use of materials which may explode, or the use of substances which may be considered hazardous in the event of an accident. For this reason it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to such a hazard. In addition, the construction and operation of the alternatives will not interfere with any established emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
11. **POPULATION.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. The relocation of any persons because of the effects upon housing, commercial, or industrial facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Significantly change the distribution, density or growth rate of the human population of an area? ( ) ( ) (XX)

In order to acquire the needed right-of-way for the alternatives being considered, it may be necessary to acquire property and to relocate some commercial or industrial facilities. Neither the construction nor the operation of any alternative is considered growth-inducing in terms of attracting population from outside the region. However, the operation of the LRT alternative may attract population from within the region to the area. It is not anticipated that this would significantly alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of human population.

12. **HOUSING.** Will the proposal:

   a. Affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Have an impact on the available rental housing in the community? ( ) (XX) ( )

   c. Result in significant demolition, relocation or remodeling of residential, commercial, or industrial or other facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

Since the alternatives are not considered to be growth-inducing in terms of attracting additional population from outside the region, it is not anticipated that the project will significantly affect existing housing or create a demand for housing. The alternatives may, however, attract some people from within the region to the area, may affect student rental housing in the UCSD vicinity, and existing condominiums along Nobel Drive. For this reason it is possible that some areas within the region may experience a slight increase in the demand for housing while others may experience a slight decrease. The need for demolition or relocation of any residential or other facilities will be evaluated.

13. **TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Significant effects on existing parking facilities or demand for new parking? (XX) ( ) ( )
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c. Impact upon existing transportation systems? (XX) ( ) ( )

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? (XX) ( ) ( )

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic? ( ) ( ) (XX)

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians? ( ) (XX) ( )

The addition of increased levels of transit to the area will increase vehicular and pedestrian movement in certain areas. Individuals who wish to ride transit will walk or drive their automobiles to a station. The alternatives will increase the demand for parking in the project area. Portions of the LRT alternatives alignments will be adjacent to or in the median of Gilman Drive or Regents Road, potentially causing a negative effect on existing traffic conditions. The LRT alternatives could result in an increase in rail traffic or introduction of rail service into some areas.

It is anticipated that the proposed alternatives will reduce vehicular traffic on area roads by diverting some vehicular trips to transit.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the proposal have a significant effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire protection? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Police protection? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Schools? ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Parks or other recreational facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

e. Maintenance of public facilities including roads? (XX) ( ) ( )

f. Other government services? ( ) ( ) (XX)

Because the alternatives being considered are not growth-inducing, it is not anticipated that the project will result in a need for new or altered public services such as fire and police protection for that aspect. The LRT alternative may result in the need for additional security procedures at stations and on government property. The alternatives being considered may afford some members of the community easier access to certain parks and recreational opportunities and therefore create increased demand. The alternative LRT alignments along Regents Road and Executive Drive may alter current services provided by the La Jolla Country Day School and UCSD. In addition, the implementation of any of the proposed transit alternatives facilities will result in additional maintenance of public facilities. Discussion of any such effects will be included in the EIR/EIS.
15. **ENERGY.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy or require the development of new sources of energy? ( ) ( ) (XX)

It is anticipated that the alternatives being considered will cause a minor reduction in regional traffic and thereby slightly reduce regional fuel consumption. However, there will be a minor increase in electrical usage for rail propulsion and diesel fuel for bus propulsion.

16. **UTILITIES.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Communications systems? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Water? ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Sewer and septic tanks? ( ) (XX) ( )

e. Storm water drainage? ( ) (XX) ( )

f. Solid waste disposal? ( ) ( ) (XX)

Some relocation of utilities may be required as a result of the selection of a specific alternative. There will, however, be no interruption in service to customers. Neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed alternatives will substantially increase the rate of consumption of most major utilities. LRT vehicles are powered by electricity, and operation of the cars would increase the consumption of electricity in the area. This increased consumption of electricity for the LRT alternative would be offset by a savings in gasoline which would occur as a result of increased ridership on the transit system.

17. **HUMAN HEALTH.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards? ( ) (XX) ( )

It is not anticipated that the construction or operation of the alternatives being considered will in any way create a negative effect on human health. The Navy has expressed concerns of the safety of transit patrons at any station in the Miramar Naval Air Station APZ.
18. **AESTHETICS.** Will the proposal result in:

a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. The destruction of a stand of trees, a rock outcropping or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature? ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Any negative aesthetic effect? ( ) (XX) ( )

The construction and operation of the stations and/or parking lots associated with the alternatives being considered may obstruct scenic vistas (Rose Canyon), views, and/or natural biological habitats which are now open to public view. Construction and operation of the alternatives may also create a site which may be considered aesthetically offensive by some members of the community. Members of the public may also find the overhead wires associated with the LRT alternative to have a negative aesthetic effect. These effects will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

19. **RECREATION.** Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities? ( ) (XX) ( )

Because the alternatives being considered may afford some members of the community easier access to certain recreational opportunities in the area, it may create an increased demand for such facilities. Some alternatives may be located adjacent to parks, open space, and nature preserves which may result in Section 4F impacts. Example areas where these impacts could occur are in Rose Canyon and in University City. Potential impacts will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

20. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure or object? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? ( ) ( ) (XX)

d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? ( ) ( ) (XX)
It is possible that construction of any of the alternatives being considered may alter or destroy undiscovered or not yet identified prehistoric or historic archeological sites. It is not anticipated that the construction or operation of the alternatives would affect such cultural resources; however, investigation into the existing record of cultural resources will be undertaken.

21. **NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS AND COASTAL ZONES:**

a. Will the proposal result in adverse impacts on navigation and use of navigable waterways? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Will the proposal result in inconsistencies with the approved Coastal Zone Management program? ( ) (XX) ( )

The proposed alternatives travel through the Coastal Zone beginning south of Genesee Avenue, north to Del Mar Heights Road. A permit may be required from the Coastal Commission for this project. Potential Impacts will be addressed in the EIS/EIR. The LRT alternatives will be required to cross the San Diego River channel. Potential impacts and mitigation measures will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

22. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well in to the future.) ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact of each resource is relatively small but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.) ( ) (XX) ( )
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ( ) ( ) (XX)

The implementation of any of the proposed alternatives is not anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts upon wildlife and vegetative habitats and population, or cultural resources. However, the possibility for such impacts, particularly in the area of wetland and biological resources, does exist and will require a survey investigation.

The project is intended to reduce motor vehicle traffic on area roads, which would reduce auto emissions, improve local air quality, and improve the flow of traffic. These are all benefits that will improve conditions in both the long and short term. When the project is considered in the light of the entire regional transit system, there may be the potential for cumulative impacts.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation, MTDB has determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared.
NOTICE OF PREPARATION LIST

October 1990/March 25, 1991

Ms. Z. Jane Blakesley MC
3911 Park Boulevard, #814
San Diego, CA 92103

Mr. John T. Laiche ME
4075-104 Crystal Dawn Lane
San Diego, CA 92122

Mr. James T. Cheshire ME
CALTRANS Env. PIng. Branch
2829 Juan Street MS Caltrans
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Dr. David Broide MC
3365 Willard Street
San Diego, CA 92122

Mr. Charles T. Newton MC
1622 Forest Way
Del Mar, CA 92014

Mr. John Bruton MC
956 Intrepid Court
Del Mar, CA 92014

Mr. Kevin G. Manning MC
9924 Juniper, #7
San Diego, CA 92104

Mr. Harold Walker MC
4318-D 47th Street
San Diego, CA 92115

Mr. Dale Disharoon MC
8638-4 Villa La Jolla Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-2363

Mr. Eric Sanders MC
7861 Normal Avenue
San Diego, CA 92041

Mr. Michael Leimbach MC
4130½ Cherokee Ave, #A
San Diego, CA 92109-2113

Mr. Bruce Eiselson MC
13144 Janetta Placa
San Diego, CA 92130

Ms. Jane Chambers MC
208 Barbara Avenue
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Mr. K.G. Manning MC
2924 Juniper Street, #7
San Diego, CA 92104

Mr. Stan Orlaski MC
1050 Camino Del Mar
Del Mar, CA 92014

Mr. Mike Kelly MA
11532 Alkaid Drive
San Diego, CA 92126

Ms. Laurie Phillips MC
8650-2 Vial La Jolla Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

Ms. Gail Clark MC
8652-2 Villa La Jolla Avenue
La Jolla, CA 92037

ME
President Audubon Society
4901 Morena Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92117

Mr. Martin Stern MC
3143 Bramerton Place
La Jolla, CA 92037

Mr. Brian Baer MC
P.O. Box 27951
San Diego, CA 92198

MS
BRW. Inc.
700 South 3rd Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Mr. Rick Pilgrim MSMA
BRW
620 C Street, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Merlin Dusterhaus MC
3863 Tomahawk Lane
San Diego, CA 92117

ME
Division of Aeronautics
CALTRANS
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
CA Native Plant Society
P.O. Box 1390
San Diego, Ca 92112

Mr. Ken Rockwell MC
P.O. Box 8778
La Jolla, CA 92038-8778

Ms. Kathy Palmer MC
CALTRANS
9633 Frascati Way
Santee, CA 92071

Mr. Dick Howard ME
CALTRANS
2829 Juan Street MS Caltrans
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Mr. Ms.
BRW, Inc.
4643 S. Ulster Street, #1180
Denver, CO 80237

Mr. Jesus Garcia ME
District Director
CALTRANS District 11
2829 Juan Street
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Mr. Jim Waters MC
CALTRANS
8080 Binney Place
La Mesa, CA 92042

ME
Div of Transp. Planning
CALTRANS
1120 N. Street, P.O. Box
1499
Sacramento, CA 95807
NOTICE OF PREPARATION LIST

October 1990/March 25, 1991

Ms. Sandy Hesnard ME
Environmental Planner
CALTRANS Div. of Aeron
P.O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001

Mr. Stu Harvey ME
Caltrans District 11
2829 Juan Street
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Mr. Mark Baza MS
CALTRANS
2824 Juan Street
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Monti Griffin ME
Citizens Coord for Century 3
1549 El Prado, #4
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. James T. Cheshire ME
CALTRANS Envir Png Branch
2829 Juan St, MS Caltrans
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

Mr. Gene Pound MA
CALTRANS District 11
2829 Juan Street
San Diego, CA 92186-5406

ME
City Clerk, City of Coronado
1825 Strand Way
Coronado, CA 92118

Mr. Stanley G. Smith MA
Church of Jesus Christ LDS
4006 Caminito Cassis
San Diego, CA 92122

ME
City Manager
City of Del Mar
Del Mar, CA 92014

ME
City Clerk
City of El Cajon
200 East Main Street
El Cajon, CA 92020

Ms. Monica Tuchsher MA
City of Del Mar
1050 Camino Del Mar
Del Mar, CA 92014

ME
City Clerk
City of El Cajon
200 East Main Street
El Cajon, CA 92020

ME
AD HOC Reg Issues Com.
City of Del Mar
1050 Camino Del Mar
Del Mar, CA 92014

ME
City Clerk
City of Lemon Grove
3232 Main Street
Lemon Grove, CA 92045

Ms. Ann Dempsey MC
Traffic Committee
City of Del Mar
1050 Camino Del Mar
Del Mar, CA 92014

Hon. Abbe Wolfsheimer MA
Councilmember
City of San Diego
202 C Street, MS 10A
San Diego, CA 92101

ME
City Clerk
City of Lemon Grove
3232 Main Street
Lemon Grove, CA 92045

Hon. Linda Bernhardt ME
Councilmember, 5th District
City of San Diego
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

ME
City Clerk
City of Imperial Beach
825 Imperial Beach Blvd.
Imperial Beach, CA 92032

Hon. Bruce Henderson MA
Councilmember
City of San Diego
202 C Street 10A
San Diego, CA 92101

ME
City Clerk
City of Imperial Beach
825 Imperial Beach Blvd.
Imperial Beach, CA 92032

Hon. Maureen O'Connor ME
Mayor, City of San Diego
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Jack McGrory MA
Assistant City Manager
City of San Diego
202 C Street, MS 9A
San Diego, Ca 92101
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Lockwood ME</td>
<td>Cty Mgr, City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 9A</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom Elder MA</td>
<td>City of San Diego Eng. C/O MTDB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>La Jolla Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Westlake MA</td>
<td>City of San Diego Plng Dept.</td>
<td>1010 Second Ave, MS 660B</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>City Clerk, City of Santee</td>
<td>10765 Woodside Avenue</td>
<td>Santee, CA 92071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steve Horn ME</td>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>1300 Broadway, Ste 1100</td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bow Bowman ME</td>
<td>Dir, Public Works</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Norman W. Hickey ME</td>
<td>Chf Admin Off, Cty of S.D.</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, MS A6</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Division ME</td>
<td>Prks &amp; Rec, City of San Diego</td>
<td>Conference Bldg, Balboa Pk</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Toomey MS</td>
<td>Senior Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>City of San Diego, MS 505</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Delotch ME</td>
<td>Fire Chief, City of San Diego</td>
<td>525 B Street, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Spaulding ME</td>
<td>Dir of Plng, City of San Diego</td>
<td>202 C Street</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sandra Barnes MS</td>
<td>Cln Wtr Prg, City of San Diego</td>
<td>401 B Street, Ste 710 MS 970</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>La Jolla Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sandra Barnes MS</td>
<td>Cln Wtr Prg, City of San Diego</td>
<td>401 B Street, Ste 710 MS 970</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>North Clairemont Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Burgreen ME</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sandra Barnes MS</td>
<td>Cln Wtr Prg, City of San Diego</td>
<td>401 B Street, Ste 710 MS 970</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Balboa Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Linda Vista Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>University Community Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tibor Varga ME</td>
<td>City of San Diego Water Utili</td>
<td>1010 Second Ave, MS 960</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael W. Huse MA</td>
<td>City Mgr, City of Solana Bch</td>
<td>380 Stevens Avenue, Ste 120</td>
<td>Solana Beach, CA 92075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Milon Mills, Jr MA</td>
<td>Dir, Cty of San Diego Wtr Utili</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 9B</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Branch</td>
<td>City of San Diego Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Milon Mills, Jr MA</td>
<td>Dir, Cty of San Diego Wtr Utili</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 9B</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Clairemont Mesa Plng Grp</td>
<td>P.O. Box 17204</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Chairman, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Milon Mills, Jr MA</td>
<td>Dir, Cty of San Diego Wtr Utili</td>
<td>202 C Street, MS 9B</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Dir., Rd Prop Mgmt Div</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Director, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Chairman, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Director, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Director, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Director, Cty Bd of Superv</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City, State, Zip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Herm Rosenthal ME</td>
<td>Planning and Land Use</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS 0175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry Watt ME</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>MS 0386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rich Sommerville ME</td>
<td>Air Pollution Control Dist</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>9150 Chesapeake Dr MS0176</td>
<td>92123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>200 West Broadway</td>
<td>92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Norm Hickey ME</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Asher ME</td>
<td>Chief of Plng, Special Projs</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>5201 Ruffin Road MS 0175</td>
<td>92123-1666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Clerk of the Bd of Supervisors</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Del Mar Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1442 Camino Del Mar</td>
<td>92104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Randall C. Hubert ME</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Cty of San Diego Env Plng</td>
<td>92123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steve Beard MS</td>
<td>ICF Kaiser Engineers</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030 N. Central Ave, Ste 401</td>
<td>5201 Ruffin Road</td>
<td>92104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Douglas Willen MC</td>
<td>Vice President-Int. Affairs</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students Assoc.</td>
<td>9106-H Regents Road</td>
<td>92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Hanks MS</td>
<td>JRH Transportation Eng.</td>
<td>Eugene, OR 97401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Fraser Engineering</td>
<td>Oceanside, CA 92054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Los Penas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Prev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 26523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Amy Perkins MC</td>
<td>Home Federal</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar, CA 92126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Taylor MP</td>
<td>KPBS-FM</td>
<td>San Diego, 92182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF Kaiser Engineers</td>
<td>707 Broadway, Suite 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030 N. Central Ave, Ste 401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>ICF Kaiser Engineers</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591 Camino De La Reina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Lewis MC</td>
<td>KTU&amp;A</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6165 Greenwich Dr, Ste 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jay Wharton MA</td>
<td>La Jolla Community Plng Assoc.</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6165 Greenwich Dr, Ste 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Taylor MP</td>
<td>KPBS-FM</td>
<td>San Diego, 92182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7677 Engineer Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>ICF Kaiser Engineers</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591 Camino De La Reina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Lewis MC</td>
<td>KTU&amp;A</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6165 Greenwich Dr, Ste 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jay Wharton MA</td>
<td>La Jolla Community Plng Assoc.</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA 92037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU&amp;A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6165 Greenwich Dr, Ste 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Publicity Director</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>News Director</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>News Director</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>News Director</td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brad Graves</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>La Jolla Light Newspaper</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John D. Berol</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>La Jolla Shores Assoc.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Oxman</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>La Jolla Shores Assoc.</td>
<td>833 Calle De Cielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dan Allen</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Allen MA</td>
<td>La Jolla Town Council</td>
<td>1055 Wall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Robenhym</td>
<td>Ms. Peggy Martin MC</td>
<td>Martin &amp; Associates</td>
<td>2717 Angell Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Lorenz</td>
<td>Mr. Dennis Wahl MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom Larwin</td>
<td>Mr. Bill Lieberman MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chris Rychel</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Bryant MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Dean</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Melaas MA</td>
<td>Comm Ping Liaison Office</td>
<td>NAS Miramar, Code Corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jerry Malhot</td>
<td>Ms. Katy McDonald MC</td>
<td>North City TMA</td>
<td>4130 La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John D. Berol</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Linda Vista COMM PING Grp</td>
<td>P.O. Box 11205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Mattox</td>
<td>Mr. John Mattox MA</td>
<td>LPA, Inc.</td>
<td>4350 La Jolla Village Dr. #130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sal Simonetti</td>
<td>Mr. Sal Simonetti MS</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Facilities</td>
<td>MCRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Morris Dye</td>
<td>Mr. Morris Dye MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Thorpe</td>
<td>Mr. Rick Thorpe MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave Ragland</td>
<td>Mr. Dave Ragland MMMA</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Price</td>
<td>Mr. Paul Price MS</td>
<td>Director of Service Devel.</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jerry Malhot</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>No City West COMM PING Grp</td>
<td>3785 Arroyo Sorrento Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Katy McDonald</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Pac Bch COMM PING Comm</td>
<td>910 Grand Avenue, Suite 201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE OF PREPARATION LIST

October 1990/March 25, 1991

Ms. P.L. Hamilton ME
Real Estate & Property Dev.
Pacific Bell
525 B Street, Room 1656
San Diego, Ca 92101

Mr. James W. Royle, Jr. ME
S.D. Archaeological Society
P.O. Box A-81106
San Diego, Ca 92138

Mr. Joe Espinosa ME
San Diego Gas & Electric
P.O. Box 1831
San Diego, CA 92112

Mr. Rich Murphy ME
VP of Operations
San Diego Transit Corp.
100 16th Street SDTC
San Diego, CA 92101

MEMP
San Diego Union Tribune
350 Camino De La Reina
San Diego, CA 92108

Mr. Jack Koerper MS
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. David C. Nunekamp ME
Chief, Office of Permit Asst
State of CA
Office of Ping and Resch
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

MP
News Editor (Del Mar)
North County Blade-Citizen
Box 90
Oceanside, CA 92049

Mr. Roger Wolfe ME
Pacific Bell
7337 Trade St, Room 5410
San Diego, CA 92121

Mr. Gordon Shields ME
S.D. County Bike Coalition
1955 Willis Road
El Cajon, CA 92020

MEML
Malcolm A. Love Library
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

Mr. Pete Tereschuck MS
San Diego Trolley, Inc.
1255 Imperial Ave, Ste 900
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. George Franck MA
Senior Transportation Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street MS 980
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Rick Alexander MS
Dir, Land Use & Pub Facil
SANDAG
401 B. Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Fred Worthley ME
Regional Manager
State of CA
Dept Fish & Game
330 Golden Shore, Ste 50
Long Beach, CA 90802

Mr. Daniel T. Allen MC
Coastal Area Comm.
Chairman, Parks & Rec Bd
1417 Kearsgate Road
La Jolla, CA 92037

ME
San Diego Chamber of Com.
110 West C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Roger Snoble ME
Pres, San Diego Transit Corp
100 16th Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Langley Powell ME
President
San Diego Trolley, Inc.
1255 Imperial Ave., Ste 900
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Ken Sulzer ME
Executive Director
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

ME
Sierra Club
3820 Ray Street
San Diego, Ca 92104

ME
Dir., Dept of Housing & Dev
State of CA
P.O. Box 952051
Sacramento, CA 94252-2051

ME
Dir. Dept of Fish & Game
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
Executive Officer
State of CA Air Resources Bd
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
EIR Review Section
State of CA Lands Comm.
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hon. Sunny Mojonnier ME
Assemblymember, 75th Dist.
State of CA Assembly
3368 Governor Drive, Ste C
San Diego, Ca 92122

Mr. George Hersh ME
Environmental Program Mgr
State of CA, Public Utili Comm
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
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ME
Dept of Parks & Recreation
State of CA
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

San Diego Coast District ME
Dept of Parks & Recreation
State of CA
2680 Carlsbad Blvd
Carlsbad, CA 92008

ME
Resources Agency
State of CA
1416 Ninth Street, Rm 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

Air Resources Board ME
EIR Regulatory Impact Div.
State of CA
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812

ME
Dept of Conserv, State of CA
1416 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
Public Utilities Commission
State of CA
1350 Front Street
San Diego, CA 92101

ME
Torrey Pines Comm Png Grp
13014 Caminito Del Rocio
Del Mar, CA 92014

ME
Soil Conservation Service
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
215 Hickory St, #126
Escondido, CA 92025-4360

Spec Asst to Secretary ME
Pacific Southwest Region
U.S. Dept of Interior
P.O. Box 36098
San Francisco, CA 94102

ME
Office of Historic Preservation
State of CA, Parks & Rec Dep
P.O. Box 2390
Sacramento, CA 95811

Executive Director ME
Water Resources Control Bd
State of CA
901 P Street
Sacramento, CA 92814

Director ME
Dept of Water Resources
State of CA
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
Torrey Pines State Prsrv ME
Dept of Parks & Recreation
State of CA
2680 Carlsbad Blvd
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Executive Director ME
Public Utilities Commission
State of CA
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

State Clearinghouse ME
Off. Png & Res, State of CA
1400 10th Street, Rm 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

ME
Dept of Water Res, South DT
State of CA
P.O. Box 6598
Los Angles, Ca 90055

San Diego Region ME
Reg Water Qual Control Bd
State of CA
9771 Clairemont Mesa Blvd
Suite B
San Diego, Ca 92124-1331

Mr. Jim Conant ME
Dir, Mass Transp, State of CA
1120 N Street
Sacramento, Ca 95814

Environmental Unit ME
Office of Attorney General
State of CA
110 West A Street, Ste 600
San Diego, Ca 92101

ME
Public Utilities Commission
State of CA
107 South Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Brooks Harper ME
Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of Interior
24000 Avila Road
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MID COAST NOP RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Charles T. Newton</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>10-31-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Paul Price</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>11-02-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Steve Wheeler</td>
<td>USDA Soil Conserv.</td>
<td>11-05-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Timothy D. Cattran</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>11-07-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>David Nunekamp</td>
<td>State Dept. of Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>11-05-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>James W. Royle, Jr.</td>
<td>S.D. Fire Dept.</td>
<td>11-13-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fred Pierson</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>11-26-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bruce E. Cannon</td>
<td>CA Dept. Parks &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>11-26-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>William V. Fait</td>
<td>UCSD (hard copy 12-3-90)</td>
<td>11-29-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Milt Phegley</td>
<td>City of S.D.</td>
<td>11-30-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Laura Loop</td>
<td>City of S.D. (hard copy 12-4-90)</td>
<td>12-03-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Allen Holden</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>12-03-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>George Lovelad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 30, 1990

Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Ave., Suite 1000
San Diego 92101-7490

Dear Sir:

My copy of CEQA rules (which is admittedly somewhat ancient), under section 15131, states that economic and social effects may be included in an EIR.

Such inclusion would be very appropriate in the Mid Coast Corridor EIR. An alternative to the auto will certainly have social effects. Economically, the rail alternative will reduce citizens' costs of gasoline, insurance, and public levies to build and maintain roads and freeways. Et cetera.

Very truly yours

[Signature]
Charles T. Newton

[Received: 10-31-90]
October 31, 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl  
Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Ave., Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA  92101-7490

RE:   NOP ON TRANSPORTATION ISSUE - MID COAST CORRIDOR

Dear Mr. Wahl:

The North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NSDCTDB) is interested in how the proposed study would integrate with the commuter rail line in two (2) respects, as follows:

1) STATIONS
   a) Where would common stations be located?
   b) How would parking demands be met?
   c) Extent & level of feeder buses -

2) RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY
   a) Where would shared ROW with the commuter rail be located?
   b) Is there sufficient space in shared ROW or 2 LRT tracks and 2 main line commuter rail tracks given the park and wetlands issues near Elvira?

I would appreciate these issues being addressed in your EIR/EIS.

Sincerely,

NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

PWP/cjc  Paul W. Price  
Director of Service Development
November 2, 1990

Dennis Wahl  
Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA  92101-7490

RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES - MID-COAST CORRIDOR: Santee Response

Dennis:

I have reviewed the above-referenced document. As you know, Santee has been a long time supporter of mass transit in general, and specifically the San Diego Trolley Light Rail Transit System. We wish MTDB success in extending the trolley through the Mid-Coast Corridor.

Although Santee supports the Mid-Coast Corridor project, we want to take this opportunity to reiterate our understanding that the El Cajon to Santee LRT Extension is the co-equal Number #3 priority for trolley expansion. We view this priority as higher than the Mid-Coast Corridor project and want to ensure that funding earmarked for the Santee extension is not diverted to the Mid-Coast Corridor.

If the Mid-Coast Corridor project is successful in reaching construction and operation, we believe that regional transit tie-ins between Santee and the Mid-Coast Corridor should be made. The success of Bus Route 870, express service from El Cajon and Santee to Kearny Mesa indicates that there is a significant demand for east-west mass transit in the region. Express bus linkages with the Mid-Coast Corridor Trolley project should be explored.

Please feel free to contact me if you require additional clarification of these issues and concerns.

Sincerely,

STEVE WHEELER  
Assistant City Manager

cc:  Ron Ballard  
     Mayor and City Council

10765 Woodside Avenue • Santee, California 92071-3198 • (619) 562-6153
Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1235 Imperial Ave., Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-2490

RE: San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board, Regional Light Rail Transit System Mid-Coast Alternatives Analysis - EIR Scoping Request

Dear Mr. Wahl:

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS) is pleased to respond to your October 25, 1990 letter concerning the above project. The following are points that should be considered in the EIR:

1. The suitability or limitation of the soils for the proposed action.
2. The provision for erosion control and water management, before, during and after construction.
3. The provisions for conservation treatment on the project lands, rights of way, and access before, during and after construction, especially seeding and planting vegetation.
4. The effects of water discharge from the project lands, especially on downstream water quality.
5. The effects of disruption of natural drainage patterns.
6. The amount of prime, statewide, local or unique farmland being lost to the project, including inducement to development.
7. The provisions for stockpiling and reusing topsoil for later use in revegetation.
8. The pollution impacts (air, soil, water, wildlife cultural resources, and archaeology) and provisions for minimizing adverse effects.

The Soil Conservation Service Escondido (619-745-2061) and El Cajon (619-442-0559) Field Offices have information on soils, farmland, drainage recommendations and erosion control measures that may help you in the preparation of the EIR. Please feel free to contact our offices for specific resource information on the project.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY D. CATTRON
Area Conservationist

cc: SCS, Escondido
SCS, El Cajon

Rec'd
11-7-90
DATE: Oct 31, 1990

TO: Reviewing Agency

RE: SAN DIEGO MTDB’s NOP for
SAN DIEGO MTDB REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT
SCH # 90011025

Attached for your comment is the SAN DIEGO MTDB’s
Notice of Preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the
SAN DIEGO MTDB REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT.

Responsible agencies must transmit their concerns and comments on the scope
and content of the EIR, focusing on specific information related to their
own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of this notice. We
encourage commenting agencies to respond to this notice and express their
concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

DENNIS WAHL
SAN DIEGO MTDB
1255 IMPERIAL AVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-7490

with a copy to 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 review process, call
Terri Lovelady at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

David C. Nunenkamp
Deputy Director, Permit Assistance

Attachments

cc: Lead Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish and Game - Regional Offices</th>
<th>Department of Transportation District Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Stacey, Regional Manager Department of Fish and Game 130 N. Main St. Redding, CA 96001 916/225-2300 (8-442)</td>
<td>Jo Sanford Caltrans, District 4 P.O. Box 876 Redding, CA 96060 916/225-5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Mesternsmith, Regional Manager Department of Fish and Game 171 N. Main St. Redding, CA 96060 916/235-0922 (8-438)</td>
<td>Michelle Gallagher Caltrans, District 4 P.O. Box 876 Redding, CA 96060 916/225-5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hunter, Regional Manager Department of Fish and Game P.O. Box 876 Redding, CA 96060 916/225-5227</td>
<td>Brian J. Smith Caltrans, District 4 P.O. Box 876 Redding, CA 96060 916/225-5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Holderman State Coastal Conservancy 1330 Broadway, Suite 200 Oakland, CA 94602 415-446-1005</td>
<td>G. Nokes, Regional Manager Department of Fish and Game 12424 Van Nuys Blvd. Van Nuys, CA 91406 818/998-3210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doralis O'Bryant Dept. of Conservation 1416 N. 3rd Street, Room 1326-2 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-5873</td>
<td>Fred A. Worthley, Jr., Reg. Manager Department of Fish and Game 330 Golden State, Suite 50 Long Beach, CA 90802 213/590-5113 (8-365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Mines and Geology</td>
<td>Div. of Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. ofd. Mines and Geology</td>
<td>Div. of Oil and Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Resources Prot. Unit</td>
<td>Independent Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Webster Dept. of Forestry 1416 N. 3rd Street, Room 1326-2 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-0128</td>
<td>John R. Newlin California Energy Commission 1510 N. 3rd St. Santa Ana, CA 92701 714/759-9900 (8-480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Kreutzbarg Office of Historic Preservation P.O. Box 92496 Sacramento, CA 94296-0001 916/322-9621</td>
<td>William A. Johnson Native American Heritage Comm. 915 Capital Mall, Room 288 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-7791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Doyle Dept. of Parks and Recreation 1416 N. 3rd Street, Room 706 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-3740</td>
<td>George Hober Public Utilities Commission 304 Van Nuys Blvd. Van Nuys, CA 91406 818/998-3210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Leena Branson Recreation Board P.O. Box 92496 Sacramento, CA 94296-0001 916/322-6421</td>
<td>Betty Eubanks State Lands Commission 1407 - 15th Street Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-2795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadeff Cuyler Dept. of Water Resources 1416 N. 3rd Street, Room 218 E Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-7646</td>
<td>Sandy Hemard Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics P.O. Box 924974 Sacramento, CA 94274-0001 916/225-1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>Qualifier To Dept. of Health 714 P Street, Room 123 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/225-6116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Consumer Services</td>
<td>William A. Johnson State Department of Consumer Affairs 1510 N. 3rd St. Santa Ana, CA 92701 714/759-9900 (8-480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Robert Stemple Dept. of General Services 400 P Street, Suite 3400 Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Allen Patton State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality 815 J Street Sacramento, CA 95814 916/322-8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH COAST REGION (1)</td>
<td>NORTH COAST REGION (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. COAST REGION (2)</td>
<td>S.F. COAST REGION (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL COAST REGION (3)</td>
<td>CENTRAL COAST REGION (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES REGION (4)</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES REGION (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5)</td>
<td>CENTRAL VALLEY REGION (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHONTAN REGION (6)</td>
<td>LAHONTAN REGION (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Basin Region (7)</td>
<td>Colorado River Basin Region (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ANA REGION (8)</td>
<td>SANTA ANA REGION (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO REGION (9)</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO REGION (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
11255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

We have reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR for the preparation of EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transporation Issues project. To enable our staff to adequately review and comment on this project, we recommend the following information be included in the Draft EIR:

1. A complete assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened and locally unique species and sensitive and critical habitats.

2. A discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts.

3. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from any increased runoff, sedimentation, soil erosion, and/or urban pollutants on streams and watercourses on or near the project site, with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts. Stream buffer areas and maintenance in their natural condition through non-structural flood control methods should also be considered in order to continue their high value as wildlife corridors.

More generally, there should be discussion of alternatives to not only minimize adverse impacts to wildlife, but to include direct benefit to wildlife and wildlife habitat. Those discussions should consider the Department of Fish and Game's policy that there should be no net loss of wetland acreage or habitat values. We oppose projects which do not provide adequate mitigation for such losses.

November 9, 1990
Diversion, obstruction of the natural flow, or changes in the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake will require notification to the Department of Fish and Game as called for in the Fish and Game Code. Notification should be made after the project is approved by the lead agency.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Kris Lal of our Environmental Services staff at (213) 590-5137.

Sincerely,

Fred Worthley
Regional Manager
Region 5

cc: Office of Planning & Research
November 8, 1990

To: Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
12255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, California 92101-7490

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
Mid-Coast Corridor from the San Diego River to Del Mar Heights Road

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for sending a copy of the subject Notice of Preparation to this Society for comment.

We note that page 15 of the initial study for the project identifies that the project may impact cultural resources. The note which follows states that "It is not anticipated that the construction or operation of the alternatives would affect such cultural resources..." By and large, this may be true, but there is at least one area, Sorrento Valley, where sensitive resources exist and could potentially be impacted. Therefore, it is appropriate that the DEIR will include cultural resources among the issues it will address. Please include SDCAS in the distribution of the DEIR when its public review period begins, and include one copy of its cultural resources technical report(s) with it when it is mailed.

The San Diego County Archaeological Society appreciates the opportunity to participate in the environmental review process for MTDB's system expansion.

Sincerely,

James W. Royle, Jr.
Chairperson, EIR Review Committee

cc: file
November 14, 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue (Suite #1000)
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION WITH
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES AND PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES; SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT
DEVELOPMENT BOARD (MTDB) REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM
MID-COAST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Dear Mr. Wahl:

The San Diego Fire Department has reviewed the above-referenced
document, which proposes three alternative routes for the Light Rail
Transit (LRT) System.

Following are the Fire Department's concerns:

1) LRT travel routes between Governor Drive and Genesee Avenue could
create minor response delays.

2) Proximity of LRT alignments to commuter rail may cause life and
safety hazards at certain junctions along the proposed route
unless clearly defined emergency communications are established
between cooperating agencies.

The Fire Department recommends the following:

1) A large scale training exercise should be conducted to train
emergency response personnel. The suggested training should
include actual hands-on demonstration (i.e. emergency door
operations, ventilation techniques, extinguishing overheated
brakes, de-energizing electrical power safely, and forcible entry).
A video would provide excellent reference information.

"BIG FIRES START SMALL: keep matches and lighters in the right hands."
2) Construction standards, such as clear height above rail and proper signage, should be similar to the existing LRT system.

If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact Garner Palenske at (619) 533-4472 or Chief Lenninger at (619) 533-4349.

Sincerely,

Monica L. Higgins
Fire Marshal

MLH:GP:cc
cc: Gary Easton, Deputy Chief
Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, California 92101

Dear Mr. Wahl:

I am writing as an individual citizen in reply to MTDB's notice of preparation of EIR/EIS dated 25 October regarding the "Mid-Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis". My comments on the scope and content, based on the material accompanying the notice, are as follows:

1.) In the definition of alternatives, in particular as defined by Map 2 in the notice, there is omission of any transit stop to serve the Torrey Pines Mesa area. This is a major employment center with what many believe already is a commitment to growth well beyond the capacity of services. Without a stop to serve this area, such as at Genesee and I-5, employees will either have to traverse the UCSD campus or go somehow all the way to Del Mar to make use of transit. These arrangements are patently unworkable, and in addition, the second alternative would put direct pressure on the widening of Carmel Valley Road in a manner that would have severe environmental impact on the Pinasquitos Lagoon.

2.) There is a major concern that the community of La Jolla (as defined by the City of San Diego's community planning district and not as defined by real estate hucksters who call it La Jolla all the way to Santee) is not going to be served by these transit routes. The nearest stop is at Gilman Drive and I-5, but the limited roads in the area make it impossible to reach that point from La Jolla without going by way of extremely long routes. That arrangement will put shuttle busses that connect La Jolla in such direct competition with auto traffic over such long stretches that the use of transit will be a ridiculous alternative for employees, residents, shoppers, tourists and all the others for whom transit is supposed to be an improvement in mobility. Your plan must be sufficiently comprehensive to include the entire transportation system serving La Jolla such as shuttle busses and the physical improvements (new lanes, bridges, etc.) necessary to make transit work.

3.) I hope you will have the courage to address the following issue: The entire proposed transit line appears to follow the pathway of least resistance, that is it goes right up the Interstate where the right-of-way is already publicly owned. This, of course, means the fewest real questions of bad urban planning over
the years past need to be addressed. It is just the right answer if one wants to throw money at the traffic problem, see it spent fast and never mind if anybody ever rides the system. The alternative is for you to address the real needs of public transportation and then determine the route afterwards, instead of picking the freeway route and inventing all the justifications for it. The biggest thing wrong with transit going up the freeway is that for users to get from wherever they are to the transit line they will have to drive or be driven (in a car, bus, bike, cab), and that puts them in direct competition with freeway motorists for the access to I-5. Certainly there can be no “park-and-ride” features of significance at the access points on I-5, first because land values have already made that use infeasible and secondly because transit user parking will make competition worse between transit and freeway users at these nodes.

4.) The University of California is one of the largest payrolls, if not the largest, in the entire San Diego metropolitan region. Tens of thousands of people commute to the campus. For the MTBE to even consider the alternative of service that bypasses the UCSD campus is absurd, a waste of taxpayer money and malfeasance of professional duty by your planners.

5.) Your consideration of alternatives does not mention bicycle traffic, particularly bicycle commuting. The good weather in San Diego, the relatively flat terrain of the mesas of this region of the city and the unique feature of a university-centered community should give this alternative means of transit a good chance. But, the UCSD change in policy in recent years against bicycling and the City of San Diego’s blindness to cycle alternatives in all of the road widening and intersection redesigns has been a setback. Can cycling as an alternative be compatible with the transit system?

Please consider these comments and revise the planned scope and content of the EIR/EIS as suggested.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Daniel T. Allen
Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Mid-Coast Corridor of the Light Rail Transit (LRT). Since the proposed project will directly impact air station land, request NAS Miramar be included in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review as a Contributing Agency.

Point of contact on this issue is Mr. Rich Melaa, Deputy Community Planning Liaison Officer at:  
OOM1
NAS Miramar
San Diego, CA 92145-5000

or telephone 537-1253.

Sincerely,

FRED E. PIERSON
Community Planning Liaison Officer
By direction Commanding Officer

12-90
Mr. Thomas F. Larwin
General Manager
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, California  92101-7490

Attn: Dennis Wahl

Dear Mr. Larwin:

We have reviewed the notice of preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) analyzing transit alternatives in the mid-Coast Corridor from the San Diego River to Del Mar Heights Road and have the following comment.

We would like to be a cooperating agency in the development of the environmental document as full FHWA involvement is required for projects on the interstate system.

The contact person in our office will be Jeff Lewis at (916) 551-1307.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

For
Bruce E. Cannon
Division Administrator
November 20, 1990

Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Mid Coast Corridor EIR/EIS For Regional Light Rail Transit System

The California State Department of Parks and Recreation, La Costa District is responsible for the management and operation of the Torrey Pines State Reserve and Los Penasquitos Lagoon Natural Preserve which are adjacent to the Genesee Avenue to Del Mar Heights Road portion of this project.

State Parks concerns regarding this project include any activities or change in conditions which could effect the integrity of the land or aquatic resources of these park units.

Please include me as a contact person on your mailing list for the La Costa District, State Department of Parks and Recreation.

Sincerely,

William V. Fait
District Superintendent

WVF:cmb
November 26, 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board, Suite 1000
1255 Imperial Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Re: Notice of Preparation/Notice of Consultation; Mid-Coast Corridor Light Rail Transit

Dear Mr. Wahl:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on these notices. As has been the case throughout the alternatives analysis, UCSD is interested in and committed to an active and cooperative participation. Our specific comments follow.

1. (Page 3) Reference to the Gilman Drive Center Segment alternative should be eliminated consistent with the MTDB-UCSD Memorandum of Agreement.

2. (Page 3) The potential east-west spur alignments and their relationship to the north-south alignments should be better described.

3. (General) The potential impact issues with the highest priority and which we prefer to see adequately addressed are land use, noise, aesthetics, open space, and community impacts such as barrier effects and station locations.

4. (Page 11) Both north-south and east-west alignment alternatives will result in substantial alteration to either existing or planned land uses. Specific UCSD examples include impacts to the proposed Science Research Park, the existing Mesa Housing, and planned academic and parking uses. Additionally, spur alignments may impact existing and future housing, as well as designated open space areas. The response category should be changed from "Maybe" to "Yes."

5. (Page 12) Although it appears that it may be reasonable to conclude that significant changes to regional population will not occur as a result of an alternative selection, significant local changes may occur. The local
distribution, density, or rate changes which may occur should be examined. The response category should be changed from "No" to "Maybe."

6. (Page 13) Again, the reference to the Gilman alternative should be eliminated.

7. (Page 13) The references to alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic impacts (none) and the possibility that LRT alternatives could result in increases are seemingly contradictory.

8. (Page 17) Although it is not readily apparent that there will be substantial adverse effects on human beings, it would seem advisable to evaluate the potential, through the use of the "Maybe" category rather than "No." This would also be consistent with the other "Mandatory Findings of Significance" sections and the "significant effect" Determination.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please direct any questions or future contact to me (534-5782).

Sincerely,

Milt Phegley
Campus Community Planner

cc: B. Darling
    V. W. Kennedy
    J. Steindorf
    S. Taylor

Faxed prior to mailing
26 November 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation for the EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation regarding transportation issues. The City of San Diego offers the following comments on the NOP:

GENERAL COMMENTS

Assembly Bill 3180 (Cortese) which was effectuated on January 1, 1989, requires public agencies to "adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment". The reporting program should be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Written documentation is required, preferably in environmental reports and in permits. The DEIR should include and reference a mitigation monitoring program for any mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

EARTH

The project boundary traverses the Rose Canyon Fault and is in very close proximity to the Carmel Valley, Torrey Pines and Mount Soledad Faults. The close proximity to the aforementioned faults and their effect on the proposed project should be addressed in the DEIR.

AIR

The City concurs with your statements that: "the alternatives
under construction should reduce the number of cars on the road, therefore, overall ambient air quality should be improved"; and "in local areas where LRT stations are proposed, some microscale degradation of air quality could exist...due to automobiles ingressing/egressing park-and-ride areas".

The 1989 California Clean Air Act requires that the revised strategy for smog, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide must be submitted to the California Air Resource Board (ARB) by mid-1991. Currently, San Diego County does not meet or attain Federal standards for smog and carbon monoxide, nor State standards for smog, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and inhalable particles. Population growth and resulting increases in traffic have begun to overcome ongoing reductions in emissions.

In 1989 the City Council adopted an ordinance for the implementation of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. This program requires City-wide employers, building owners and developers to implement strategies designed to reduce peak hour vehicle trips and work towards meeting Federal and State mandated clean air standards. The DEIR should address how the proposed LRT and alternatives could reduce local San Diego air pollution and achieve Federal and State mandated air quality goals by reducing emissions from vehicles used for commuting between the home and the worksite.

The DEIR should address whether the proposed project and alternatives affect the ability of the revised Regional Air Quality Strategy to meet the Federal clean air standards? More specifically:

Does the proposed project incorporate necessary improvements to the traffic signal operation located in the vicinity of the proposed LRT stations to achieve a Level of Service C or above?

Does the proposed project incorporate bicycle parking facilities at the proposed LRT stations?

Bus transit alternatives would operate on diesel power and increase the emissions of diesel fume particles and hydrocarbons. Buses generated by an alternative form of energy, such as electricity or gasohol, should be considered. These forms of energy could lower the emission levels of pollutants.

WATER

The proposed LRT has the potential to disrupt the flow rate and increase silting in the San Diego River; Rose, San Clemente, Tecolote and Penasquitos Creeks; and other drainage ways in the corridor vicinity. The DEIR should also address parking lot runoff and its impact on watersheds and drainage ways. On-site infiltration of stormwater into the ground is one of the most
effective ways to reduce the quantity of stormwater runoff. Limiting the proportion of the site covered by impervious surfaces would help to ensure on-site infiltration. Impervious surfaces, such as parking lots, not only increase the amount of runoff from a site, but they also produce runoff that contains petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants.

PLANT LIFE

See above comment regarding parking lot runoff.

Since a large portion of the LRT alignments follow existing railroad and freeway rights-of-way, it could be anticipated that construction of the alternatives would not adversely disturb the diversity or numbers of plant species. However, disturbance could occur during construction of the rail in areas where a right-of-way is not in existence. All disturbed areas should be landscaped with native species. Both a mitigation monitoring and maintenance program and a revegetation plan should be included in the DEIR.

NOISE

Would sound attenuation walls be required for residences adjacent to the railroad tracks? If needed, design and grading for these walls should be addressed at this stage of the DEIR.

LIGHT AND GLARE

Street and parking lot lights must comply with the City’s Light Pollution Law (Section 101.1300 of the Municipal Code). Also, consideration should be given to solar generated parking lot lighting.

POPULATION/LAND USE

Although neither the construction nor the operation of any alternative is considered growth-inducing in terms of attracting population from outside the region, the proposed project may encourage clustering of residential and commercial nodes around the transportation stations. The DEIR should determine whether this would result in a substantial alteration to existing or planned land uses in the area.

ENERGY

See comment regarding alternative forms of energy for mass transit under AIR.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The proposed project’s effect on cultural resources is unknown until site testing is completed, therefore, the EIR should
address whether the proposed project would impact cultural resources including religious or sacred use areas.

We look forward to reviewing the EIR/EIS. Please provide a copy to our office for our review and comment. If you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact Laura Loop at 236-6650.

Sincerely,

Mary Ladiana

Ann B. Hix, Principal Planner
City Planning Department

ML: LAL

cc: Thomas T. Story
    Linda Johnson
    Mary Lee Balko
    Mary Ladiana
    Laura A. Loop
November 30, 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Dennis:

This is in response to your request for review of the notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Consultation regarding transportation issues for the Mid Coast LRT Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIR).

We have reviewed the NOP and the Notice of Consultation and do not have any adverse comments from a transportation standpoint.

We are looking forward to working with MTDB during review and processing of the EIR and EIS for the Mid Coast LRT.

Sincerely,

Allen Holden, Jr.
Deputy Director,
Transportation Planning Division

cc: Jonathan Levy
    Victor Rollinger
November 29, 1990

11-SD-005
R20.0-R36.3

Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS for the Mid - Coast Corridor
SCH 90011025

Caltrans District 11 looks forward to the opportunity to review the subject documents(s). Our comments on the NOP are as follows:

1. Transportation/Circulation - Our agency has been working with the MTDB to determine if existing park-and-ride facilities can be used for the extension of LRT to Carmel Valley Road.

2. Animal/Plant Life - Map 2 indicates that the north segment could encroach into our biological mitigation site at Carmel Valley Creek.

Our initial contact person for Interstate Route 5 is Jim Linthicum, Project Manager, Project Studies Branch "B", (619) 688-6952.

Sincerely,

JESUS M. GARCIA
District Director

By

JAMES T. CHESHIRE, Chief
Environmental Planning Branch

MO:ec

Rcd'd
12-3-90
December 11, 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Subject: Notice of Preparation of EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transportation Issues (Mid Coast Corridor LRT)

Dear Mr. Wahl:

This is in reference to the subject EIR/EIS notice of preparation. Following are the Park and Recreation Departments comments relative to open space and park issues.

I. Open Space Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page/Item</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General</td>
<td>We realize that this document is not intended to provide specifics, but it does raise issues which will require detailed answers. Early liaison with our Open Space Division will be of assistance in resolving issues before they become problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Page 3, (LRT alignment options), Maps 1 and 2</td>
<td>These pages describe alignments which appear to be in or near City-owned open space or areas with open space easements. Of particular concern are the alignments affecting Rose Canyon and Marian Bear Memorial Park (San Clemente Canyon) which is dedicated parkland and subject to the restrictions of Charter Section 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Page 10, Plant Life</td>
<td>Because of the proximity to open space, the EIR/EIS should address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reid
12-21-90
the issues of land needed for equipment staging, and the compatibility of any imported fill dirt to reduce the possibility of introducing undesirable plant life.

II. Park Issues

There are no comments submitted at this time relative to park issues or the adequacy of the Notice of Preparation.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

for GEORGE I. LOVELAND
Park and Recreation Director

VJM:sv:PDLT3340

cc: N. Acevedo
    V. Marchetti
March 25, 1991

Dear Interested Agency/Citizen:

Subject: REvised Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transportation Issues: Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor (SCH90011025)

Enclosed is a revised Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transportation issues from the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) analyzing transit alternatives being studied in the Mid-Coast Corridor from the planned Old Town Station to Del Mar Heights Road in the Cities of San Diego and Del Mar. This revision was necessary because one of the light rail transit (LRT) alternatives (UCSD/Gilman Drive) has been eliminated and a new LRT alternative (Genesee Avenue) has been added. MTDB will be the Lead Agency for this project and will supervise the preparation of the document, which will be prepared in cooperation with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). We need to know your views or the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Please read the enclosed material carefully. Your agency may need to use the environmental document prepared by MTDB when considering your permit or the approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the probable environmental effects are contained in the enclosed materials. A copy of an Initial Study is enclosed. The clearing house number for this project is SCH90011025. Due to time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than April 26, 1991.

Please send your response including the name of the contact person in your agency to:

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490
Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas F. Larwin
General Manager

TFL:1m/paw
L-ISSUES.DJW

Enclosures: Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation
Initial Study
TO: Interested Agency/Citizen

FROM: San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

SUBJECT: REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION WITH TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES AND PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES; SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (MTDB) REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM MID-COAST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

MTDB hereby presents revised notice that an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) will be prepared for the Mid-Coast Corridor of the regional light rail transit system pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.4. MTDB also presents notice of consultation with transportation planning agencies and public agencies which have transportation facilities within their jurisdiction that could be affected by this project, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21092.4.

BACKGROUND

MTDB, in cooperation with the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), is evaluating alternatives for improving mass transit services in the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor has been defined as extending from the area near the junction of Interstate 5 and Interstate 8, north along Interstate 5 to the vicinity of Del Mar Heights Road (See Map 1). This evaluation is being conducted as part of the MTDB program to develop and implement transit system improvements throughout the metropolitan service area.

Transit improvements are being proposed in the Mid-Coast Corridor to reduce transit travel times and thus, increase the availability of travel options for Mid-Coast residents to points elsewhere in the metropolitan service area, for jobs, education, medical, shopping, and cultural opportunities. Residents throughout the region would benefit from improved access and mobility in the corridor. Improved transit service could also provide opportunities for economic development in the Corridor consistent with adopted growth and infrastructure policies.

A Mid-Coast Corridor EIR/EIS/Alternatives Analysis will evaluate several improvement alternatives:

* No-Build - This alternative includes new transportation improvements which are programmed for construction within the next six years, including all TransNet Projects funded by the Proposition A local sales tax in 1987, and projects identified in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Major projects in the STIP within the I-5 corridor are Stage I of the I-5/SR-56 interchange and three interchange modifications in University City funded as Facility Benefit Assessment Projects.
- **TSM** - The Transportation Systems Management alternative includes increased transit services and facilities consisting of all projects from the No-Build alternative plus increased express and local bus service. Selected priority treatments (carpool/bus lanes) and new or expanded park-and-ride lots and transit centers are included.

- **HOV Lanes** - All projects from the TSM alternative plus High Occupancy Vehicle lanes on I-5 south of Del Mar Heights Road to the vicinity of I-8 will be included in this alternative. Some transit services would be realigned to utilize the HOV lanes.

- **LRT** - This alternative consists of Light Rail Transit along one or more alignments depending upon the results of screening during the EIR/EIS/AA process that may reduce the number of alignment options. The alignment options consist of:
  - **South Segment**: San Diego River [Old Town Station to Gilman Drive]
    - The alignment would run adjacent to the AT&SF railroad line
  - **Center Segment**: Gilman Drive to Genesee Avenue
    - Three alignment alternatives will be examined:
      1. Along Gilman Drive, through the University of California San Diego to run along I-5;
      2. Along I-5;
      3. Along the AT&SF rail line to Regents Road, then along Regents Road to Genesee Avenue before returning to I-5; and
      4. Along the AT&SF rail line to Genesee Avenue, then along Genesee Avenue to I-5, and then returning to I-5.
  - **North Segment**: Genesee Avenue to Del Mar Heights Road
    - The alignment would generally follow I-5.

Within the Center Segment, an east/west Spur is planned. The Spur will extend from the Mainline to provide service east through University City. One option ends the Spur west of I-805, while a second option continues the Spur over I-805 and then along Miramar Road to the vicinity of the proposed Miramar Commuter Rail Station.
The evaluation will be conducted in consultation with the City of San Diego and other local agencies, Caltrans and other State agencies, Federal agencies including Miramar Naval Air Station, the Federal Highway Administration, and UMTA, interest groups, and the public.

PROJECT LOCATION

The attached maps show the following:

Map 1. San Diego region showing the Corridor study area and the location of presently operating and future proposed LRT lines.

Map 2. Alternative LRT alignments to be considered in the EIR/EIS.

REQUESTS FOR RESPONSE TO THIS NOTICE

MTDB requests comments from responsible agencies as to the scope and content of environmental information which is germane to that responsible agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project and which should be included in the environmental impact report.

MTDB also requests comments from transportation planning agencies and public agencies which have transportation facilities within their jurisdiction which could be affected by the project. This request for comments is for the purpose of obtaining information concerning the project's effect on major local arterial, public transit, freeways, highways and rail transit service within the jurisdiction of such agencies. This request for comments shall constitute the consultation required by Public Resources Code § 21092.4.

This notice should also serve to inform other interested parties of the initiation of the EIR/EIS.
MID-COAST CORRIDOR
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS /DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT STUDY

Map 1. Corridor Study Area
MTDB  Map 2. Alternative LRT Alignments

North Line/Mid-Coast LRT Alignment

- Preferred LRT Alignment
- Alternative LRT Alignments
- LRT Station Sites Under Study
- Future LRT Extensions
- Future Commuter Rail
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following checklist details the areas of probable environmental effect. After each series of checklist questions, there is a discussion of the environmental findings in relation to the project.
1. **EARTH.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?  
   
   b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil?  

   c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?  

   d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?  

   e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?  

   f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition, or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?  

   g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?  

   Construction of any of the build alternatives would require grading which has the potential to disrupt the soil.

It is not anticipated that the proposed alternatives would cause or create unstable earth conditions; however, it is possible that such conditions may be encountered during construction. The alternatives being considered would not alter the underlying geologic structure, or destruct, cover, or modify any known unique geologic feature. Construction could affect soil erosion; however, the construction plans will include requirements to minimize these effects. The project boundary traverses the Rose Canyon Fault. Any alternative selected would be designed and constructed according to seismic requirements in order to protect property and minimize possible major geologic hazards.
2. **AIR.** Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The creation of objectionable odors?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose the project residents to severe air pollution conditions?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alternatives under consideration should reduce the number of cars on the road, therefore overall ambient air quality should be improved. In general, there are no objectionable odors associated with the construction or operation of electrified LRT systems. Bus transit alternatives would operate on diesel power and increase the emissions of diesel fumes particulates, and hydrocarbons. In localized areas where LRT stations are proposed, some microscale degradation of air quality could exist in the morning and afternoon peak hours due to automobiles entering/egressing park-and-ride/kiss-and-ride areas.

The project does not have the potential to alter movements of air, moisture, or temperature either locally or regionally.

3. **WATER.** Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Significant changes in temperature, flow or chemical content of surface thermal springs?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the alternatives being considered has the potential to disrupt the flow rate and increase siltation in the San Diego River, Rose, San Clemente, Tecolote, and Penasquitos Creeks and other drainage ways in the Corridor vicinity, and possibly change the direction of water movements where turn radii need to be straightened to maximize train speeds. It is not anticipated that the alternatives will affect groundwater levels or the quality of groundwater resources. Some additional surface water runoff can be expected. The amount will depend on the alternatives selected and the size of the capital facilities, such as transit centers, park-and-ride lots, and LRT stations. A crossing of the San Diego River is necessary for the LRT alternatives. With the possible exception of flash flood areas, the project would not expose people to water related hazards. It is possible that the LRT alternatives could result in flood plain encroachment at floodway crossings. The amount of encroachment, if any, will be minimized through design of crossing structures. Specific drainage changes will be further investigated during the study process.

4. **PLANT LIFE.** Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Change in the diversity of species or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>(XX)</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or result in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species? ( ) ( ) (XX)

d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop? ( ) ( ) (XX)

A large portion of the alignments being considered under the LRT alternative follow existing railroad and freeway right-of-way, and therefore it is not anticipated that construction of the alternatives in this area would affect the diversity or numbers of any species of plant. However, in areas where the LRT alignment deviates from the existing railroad and freeway right-of-way, the alternative alignments do traverse areas that are currently considered to be sensitive habitat, thus having the potential to change the diversity or number of plant species. Reduction in the diversity or number of plant species could result in the reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species which may exist in the study vicinity. A biological resources study will be conducted to determine any impacts.

Construction and operation of LRT alternatives and stations could involve revegetation or landscaping, but it is not anticipated that the project will introduce any new species or plant into the area, or act as a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species. There is no agriculture in the area, and the project will not result in the reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop.

5. **Animal Life.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Change in the diversity of species or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish, and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals? ( ) ( ) (XX)

d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat? ( ) (XX) ( )

Portions of the study area traverse identified sensitive habitat that could contain sensitive or endangered species. A biological assessment will be performed as part of the environmental process.
Construction and operation of any alternative being considered does not involve the introduction of animal species into an area or create a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.

6. **NOISE.** Will the proposal result in:  
   
   a. Increases in existing noise levels?  
      
      (XX)  ( )  ( )  
   
   b. Exposures of people to severe noise levels?  
      
      ( )  (XX)  ( )  

   The construction of any alternative will increase existing noise levels in noise sensitive locations adjacent to the construction area. Operation of any alternative will increase existing noise levels at any given point along the alignment whenever a transit vehicle passes that location. A noise study will be conducted to determine if the operation of the transit alternatives are expected to expose people to severe noise levels and noise impacts. The Study also will propose mitigation measures if needed.

7. **LIGHT AND GLARE.** Will the proposal:  
   
   a. Produce new light or glare from street lights or other sources?  
      
      ( )  (XX)  ( )  
   
   b. Reduce access to sunlight of adjacent properties due to shade and shadow.  
      
      ( )  (XX)  ( )  

   Lighting used in transit stations and parking areas can be designed in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts. Should the LRT be elevated in certain locations, shadows could cause some reduction in sunlight.

8. **LAND USE.** Will the proposal result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?  
   
   ( )  (XX)  ( )  

   Although some changes may be necessary to accommodate any alternative being considered, the project would not result in any substantial alteration to existing or planned land uses in the area.
9. **NATURAL RESOURCES.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable resources? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   The implementation of any alternative will reduce the number of automobiles traveling the roads in the area and thus would reduce the amount of gasoline used.

10. **RISK OF UPSET.** Does the proposal involve:

   a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? ( ) ( ) (XX)

   The construction and operation of the alternatives being considered does not involve the use of materials which may explode, or the use of substances which may be considered hazardous in the event of an accident. For this reason it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to such a hazard. In addition, the construction and operation of the alternatives will not interfere with any established emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

11. **POPULATION.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. The relocation of any persons because of the effects upon housing, commercial, or industrial facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Significantly change the distribution, density or growth rate of the human population of an area? ( ) ( ) (XX)
In order to acquire the needed right-of-way for the alternatives being considered, it may be necessary to acquire property and to relocate some commercial or industrial facilities. Neither the construction nor the operation of any alternative is considered growth-inducing in terms of attracting population from outside the region. However, the operation of the LRT alternative may attract population from within the region to the area. It is not anticipated that this would significantly alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of human population.

12. **HOUSING.** Will the proposal:

   a. Affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Have an impact on the available rental housing in the community? ( ) (XX) ( )

   c. Result in significant demolition, relocation or remodeling of residential, commercial, or industrial or other facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

Since the alternatives are not considered to be growth-inducing in terms of attracting additional population from outside the region, it is not anticipated that the project will significantly affect existing housing or create a demand for housing. The alternatives may, however, attract some people from within the region to the area, may affect student rental housing in the UCSD vicinity, and existing condominiums along Nobel Drive. For this reason it is possible that some areas within the region may experience a slight increase in the demand for housing while others may experience a slight decrease. The need for demolition or relocation of any residential or other facilities will be evaluated.

13. **TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Will the proposal result in:

   a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? ( ) (XX) ( )

   b. Significant effects on existing parking facilities or demand for new parking? (XX) ( ) ( )

   c. Impact upon existing transportation systems? (XX) ( ) ( )

   d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? (XX) ( ) ( )
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e. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic? ( ) (XX) ( )

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians? ( ) (XX) ( )

The addition of increased levels of transit to the area will increase vehicular and pedestrian movement in certain areas. Individuals who wish to ride transit will walk or drive their automobiles to a station. The alternatives will increase the demand for parking in the project area. Portions of the LRT alternatives alignments will be adjacent to or in the median of Gilman Drive or Regents Road, or Genesee Avenue, potentially causing a negative effect on existing traffic conditions. The LRT alternatives could result in an increase in rail traffic or introduction of rail service into some areas.

It is anticipated that the proposed alternatives will reduce vehicular traffic on area roads by diverting some vehicular trips to transit.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the proposal have a significant effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire protection? ( ) ( ) (XX)

b. Police protection? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Schools? ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Parks or other recreational facilities? ( ) (XX) ( )

e. Maintenance of public facilities including roads? (XX) ( ) ( )

f. Other government services? ( ) ( ) (XX)

Because the alternatives being considered are not growth-inducing, it is not anticipated that the project will result in a need for new or altered public services such as fire and police protection for that aspect. The LRT alternative may result in the need for additional security procedures at stations and on government property. The alternatives being considered may afford some members of the community easier access to certain parks and recreational opportunities and therefore create increased demand. The alternative LRT alignments along Regents Road and Executive Drive may alter current services provided by the La Jolla Country Day
School and UCSD. In addition, the implementation of any of the proposed transit alternatives facilities will result in additional maintenance of public facilities. Discussion of any such effects will be included in the EIR/EIS.

15. **ENERGY.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy or require the development of new sources of energy? ( ) ( ) (XX)

It is anticipated that the alternatives being considered will cause a minor reduction in regional traffic and thereby slightly reduce regional fuel consumption. However, there will be a minor increase in electrical usage for rail propulsion and diesel fuel for bus propulsion.

16. **UTILITIES.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Communications systems? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Water? ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Sewer and septic tanks? ( ) (XX) ( )

e. Storm water drainage? ( ) (XX) ( )

f. Solid waste disposal? ( ) ( ) (XX)

Some relocation of utilities may be required as a result of the selection of a specific alternative. There will, however, be no interruption in service to customers. Neither the construction nor the operation of the proposed alternatives will substantially increase the rate of consumption of most major utilities. LRT vehicles are powered by electricity, and operation of the cars would increase the consumption of electricity in the area. This increased consumption of electricity for the LRT alternative would be offset by a savings in gasoline which would occur as a result of increased ridership on the transit system.

17. **HUMAN HEALTH.** Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? ( ) ( ) (XX)
b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

It is not anticipated that the construction or operation of the alternatives being considered will in any way create a negative effect on human health. The Navy has expressed concerns of the safety of transit patrons at any station in the Miramar Naval Air Station APZ Accident Potential Zone.

18. AESTHETICS. Will the proposal result in:

a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?

b. Will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

c. The destruction of a stand of trees, a rock outcropping or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature?

d. Any negative aesthetic effect?

The construction and operation of the stations and/or parking lots associated with the alternatives being considered may obstruct scenic vistas (Rose Canyon), views, and/or natural biological habitats which are now open to public view. Construction and operation of the alternatives may also create a site which may be considered aesthetically offensive by some members of the community. Members of the public may also find the overhead wires associated with the LRT alternative to have a negative aesthetic effect. These effects will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

19. RECREATION. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

Because the alternatives being considered may afford some members of the community easier access to certain recreational opportunities in the area, it may create an increased demand for such facilities. Some alternatives may be located adjacent to parks, open space, and nature preserves which may result in Section 4F impacts. Example areas where these impacts could occur are in Rose Canyon and in University City. Potential impacts will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
20. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure or object? ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? ( ) ( ) (XX)

d. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? ( ) ( ) (XX)

It is possible that construction of any of the alternatives being considered may alter or destroy undiscovered or not yet identified prehistoric or historic archeological sites. It is not anticipated that the construction or operation of the alternatives would affect such cultural resources; however, investigation into the existing record of cultural resources will be undertaken.

21. **NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS AND COASTAL ZONES:**

a. Will the proposal result in adverse impacts on navigation and use of navigable waterways? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Will the proposal result in inconsistencies with the approved Coastal Zone Management program? ( ) (XX) ( )

The proposed alternatives travel through the Coastal Zone beginning south of Genesee Avenue, north to Del Mar Heights Road. A permit may be required from the Coastal Commission for this project. Potential impacts will be addressed in the EIS/EIR. The LRT alternatives will be required to cross the San Diego River channel. Potential impacts and mitigation measures will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
22. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ( ) (XX) ( )

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well in to the future.) ( ) (XX) ( )

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact of each resource is relatively small but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.) ( ) (XX) ( )

d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ( ) ( ) (XX)

The implementation of any of the proposed alternatives is not anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts upon wildlife and vegetative habitats and population, or cultural resources. However, the possibility for such impacts, particularly in the area of wetland and biological resources, does exist and will require a survey investigation.

The project is intended to reduce motor vehicle traffic on area roads, which would reduce auto emissions, improve local air quality, and improve the flow of traffic. These are all benefits that will improve conditions in both the long and short term. When the project is considered in the light of the entire regional transit system, there may be the potential for cumulative impacts.
DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation, MTDB has determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared.
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</tbody>
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Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Ave., Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Dennis:

I have finished reviewing the Revised Notice of Preparation for the Mid-Coast Corridor.

There are two areas of primary concern to bicyclists relating to your proposal to align the light rail transit system adjacent to the AT&SF railroad line.

1. As part of the San Diego-Oceanside Commuter Rail Study, a separate study was made by Morrison-Knudsen entitled Coastal Corridor Bicycle Path Analysis in May, 1989. It addressed the feasibility of constructing a coastal bicycle path between Oceanside and San Diego, a distance of 42 miles running within the existing right of way of AT&SF. Conclusions were that such a path was both feasible and economically possible. It is our position that any study done of EIR/EIS must take into consideration the impact that building the light rail system would have on the construction of such a path. The main point that must be addressed is whether the railroad right-of-way is wide enough to include both the rail system and the bicycle path, especially in the area from Old Town Station north along Morena to Gilman Drive.

2. The present bicycle route along Santa Fe Street from Balboa Avenue to the beginnings of the bike path through Rose Canyon is one of the most heavily traveled routes in the city. Any type of construction that would in any way affect bicycle use of this route at all times must be addressed.

Yours truly,

Gordy Shields, for SDCBC
1955 Willis Rd
El Cajon, CA 92020
444-6425

P.O. Box 34544  San Diego, Ca 92163
April 1, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Ave, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

RE: Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor EIR/EIS (SCH90011025)

Dear Mr. Wahl:

We are pleased to respond to your March 25, 1991 request concerning the above project. As an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the primary function of the Soil Conservation Service is to give technical and sometime financial assistance, through local Resource Conservation Districts, to individuals, groups and unit of government which influence and made decisions about conservation, development and use of natural resources.

The Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs) are legal subdivisions of state government, responsible under state law for conservation work within their boundaries. The purpose of RCDs is to develop programs to solve land, water and related resource problems. RCDs enlist and coordinate help from all public and private sources that can contribute to accomplishing a district's goals.

With regard to our function as providers of technical assistance to the RCDs, the Soil Conservation Service has the following comments:

1. Use existing natural resource surveys (i.e. San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego County Important Farmland Maps and National Wetlands Inventory Maps, etc.) in making present and future land use decisions.

2. Identify the suitability or limitation of soils for proposed action. Discuss provisions for stockpiling and reusing topsoil for later use in revegetation.

3. Discussion is needed of potential adverse impacts from any increased runoff, sedimentation, soil erosion, and/or urban pollutants on streams, watercourses and groundwater on or near the project site with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts.

4. What changes would the proposed project have on absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? What effect would project implementation have on downstream water quality?
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5. Provide a complete description of the planning area. This should include current and planned land use designations, the number of acres in agriculture production, soil classifications, cropping history, and whether the site is considered prime agricultural land.

Whether any land under a Williamson Act contract or Agricultural preserve will be in or near the planning area and, if so, how development will affect these designations.

The possible mitigation measures to ensure that agricultural land is not prematurely or unnecessarily converted to non-agricultural uses. These could include use of the Williamson Act, right-to-farm ordinances, and phased development.

The conflicts which can arise from the close proximity of agricultural and urban areas due to noise, dust, chemical usage, trespassing, and traffic. Include any buffering measures which are proposed for the development.

The pressure this project could create to convert surrounding agricultural land to urban uses. How will this project affect the transition between more intense urban uses and the nearby agricultural lands?

Whether development of the area constitutes contiguous growth.

6. Provide a complete assessment of sensitive biological habitats in project area with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive and critical habitats.

A discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources with specific measures to offset such impacts.

The Soil Conservation Service has information on the above resource maps and surveys, as well as information on flood control, farmland protection, and other resource conservation information that may help you in the preparation of the EIR. Please feel free to contact our offices in Escondido at 745-2061 or in El Cajon at 442-0559.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY D. CATTRON
Area Conservationist
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To: Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, California 92101-7490

Subject: Revised Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS
Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for sending this Society a copy of the subject revised Notice of Preparation.

As we indicated when we responded to the original Notice of Preparation, we are pleased to note the inclusion of cultural resources in the list of issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the project. We will be pleased to provide our comments on the document when it is distributed for review. To that end, please ensure that we are sent one copy each of the EIR/EIS and its cultural resources technical report(s) at that time.

The San Diego County Archaeological Society appreciates being included in MTDB's environmental review process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: file

[Stamp: Rec'd 4-8-9]
DATE: Apr 04, 1991

TO: Reviewing Agency

RE: SAN DIEGO MTDB's NOP for
SAN DIEGO MTDB REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT
SCH # 90011025

Attached for your comment is the SAN DIEGO MTDB's
Notice of Preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the
SAN DIEGO MTDB REGIONAL LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT.

Responsible agencies must transmit their concerns and comments on the
scope and content of the EIR, focusing on specific information related
to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of this
notice. We encourage commenting agencies to respond to this notice and
express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

DENNIS WAHL
SAN DIEGO MTDB
1255 IMPERIAL AVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-7490

with a copy to 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 review process, call
Tom Loftus at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

David C. Nunenkamp
Deputy Director, Permit Assistance

Attachments

cc: Lead Agency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish and Game - Regional Offices</th>
<th>Department of Transportation District Contacts</th>
<th>State and Consumer Services</th>
<th>Environmental Affairs</th>
<th>State Water Resources Control Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Stacey, Regional Manager</td>
<td>Joan Sanford</td>
<td>Robert Steggs</td>
<td>Bob Fletcher</td>
<td>Allan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 1</td>
<td>Dept. of General Services</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 Locust</td>
<td>1350 Union Street</td>
<td>400 F Street, Suite 1200</td>
<td>100 East Cypress Avenue</td>
<td>Division of Leases &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding, CA 96001</td>
<td>Eureka, CA 95501</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>Redding, CA 96001</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/225-2300 (8-442)</td>
<td>707/443-6671 (8-338)</td>
<td>916/522-5227</td>
<td>916/225-3259 (8-442)</td>
<td>916/442-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Messmann, Regional Manager</td>
<td>Michelle Gallagher</td>
<td>Jerry Laumer</td>
<td>Gary McGreeney</td>
<td>Andy Zelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 2</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 3</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 7</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A</td>
<td>1457 Riverside Drive</td>
<td>703 B Street</td>
<td>220 South Spring Street</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova, CA 95740</td>
<td>Redding, CA 96001</td>
<td>Yreka, CA 96097</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/355-9922 (8-438)</td>
<td>916/225-3259 (8-442)</td>
<td>916/551-962 (9-597)</td>
<td>213026-2376 (8-640)</td>
<td>209/472-0693 (8-627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Hunter, Regional Manager</td>
<td>Brian J. Smith</td>
<td>Jerry Laumer</td>
<td>Harvey Sawyer</td>
<td>Al Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 3</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 6</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 47</td>
<td>705 B Street</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1366</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2048</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yreka, CA 95999</td>
<td>Yreka, CA 95999</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1114</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/444-5318</td>
<td>916/444-5318</td>
<td>916/551-962 (9-597)</td>
<td>916/322-2795</td>
<td>916/442-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Nokes, Regional Manager</td>
<td>Fred A. Worthley, Jr., Reg. Manager</td>
<td>William A. Johnson</td>
<td>Gary McGreeney</td>
<td>Andy Zelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Comm.</td>
<td>220 South Spring Street</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234 East Shaw Avenue</td>
<td>330 Golden Oak Lane, Suite 30</td>
<td>93 Capital Mall, Room 288</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA 93710</td>
<td>913/777-7565</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>213026-2376 (8-640)</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209/222-3761 (8-421)</td>
<td>213/777-7565</td>
<td>916/322-7791</td>
<td>916/322-2795</td>
<td>916/322-2795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Commissions</th>
<th>Environmental Affairs</th>
<th>State Water Resources Control Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John R. Nuffer</td>
<td>Bob Fletcher</td>
<td>Allan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516 Ninth Street</td>
<td>100 East Cypress Avenue</td>
<td>Division of Leases &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>Redding, CA 96002</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/322-9180</td>
<td>916/224-4845 (ATS 441)</td>
<td>916/442-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>916/224-4845 (ATS 441)</td>
<td>916/739-4414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Johnson</td>
<td>Jerry Laumer</td>
<td>Dave Beringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Comm.</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 3</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Capital Mall, Room 288</td>
<td>220 South Spring Street</td>
<td>Delta Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/322-7791</td>
<td>213026-2376 (8-640)</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business, Transportation, &amp; Housing</th>
<th>Environmental Affairs</th>
<th>State Water Resources Control Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hemard</td>
<td>Bob Fletcher</td>
<td>Allan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras - Division of Aeronautics</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 942274</td>
<td>100 East Cypress Avenue</td>
<td>Division of Leases &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95824</td>
<td>Redding, CA 96002</td>
<td>P.O. Box 942212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/324-1381</td>
<td>916/224-4845 (ATS 441)</td>
<td>916/442-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. Jim Weddel</td>
<td>Jerry Laumer</td>
<td>Dave Beringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 7</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Planning Section</td>
<td>220 South Spring Street</td>
<td>Delta Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Analysis Division</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2555 Flem Avenue</td>
<td>213026-2376 (8-640)</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95818</td>
<td>916/322-2795</td>
<td>916/633-9870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/442-1981</td>
<td>916/322-2795</td>
<td>Ed Antone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Helsang</td>
<td>Harvey Sawyer</td>
<td>Mike Falkenthaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras - Planning</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 942274</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>Division of Water Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95824</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>988 P Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/324-1381</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916/442-1981</td>
<td>Calaveras, District 10</td>
<td>916/633-5634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 4, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, Ca 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

This is in response to your March 25, 1991 letter regarding the "REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES: MID-COAST TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (SCH90011025)". Your project may have an impact on a Council-approved project to reconstruct the I-5/Genesee Avenue Interchange (CIP 52-372). This project's description and schedule are attached. At present, we have hired Ferver Engineering Company to prepare a Project Report and Environmental Documents (PR/ED) in order for the City to obtain CalTrans' authorization for final design of the selected alternative. The PR/ED phase has just begun and may take a year to complete.

Our Consultant Agreement with Ferver Engineering requires that the PR/ED be coordinated with MTDB and other agencies. Therefore, I hope that we can continue to work together on our respective projects to our mutual benefit. Please contact me at 236-7743 for any assistance.

Very truly yours,

Paul Toomey
Project Manager

PT/mc

cc: C. Savage/CalTrans
J. Richard Lawrence/Ferver Engineering
W. O. 119595

Enclosure
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CITY OF SAN DIEGO

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

CIP NO. 52-172.0
TITLE: GENESSEE AVENUE - WIDEN I-5 CROSSING
COUNCIL DISTRICT 1
COMMUNITY PLAN 47
INITIAL SCHEDULE 87/92/00

DEPARTMENT: ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPT  STREETS
EXPENDITURE: LAND 1,378,000 EMOR/CONSTR 24,568,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,946,000 FBA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>3,392,000</td>
<td>1,378,000</td>
<td>20,776,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>3,392,000</td>
<td>1,378,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,946,000 TOTAL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>3,392,000</td>
<td>1,378,000</td>
<td>20,776,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: This project provides for the widening of Genessee Avenue to six lanes with a 26 foot median (800 feet on each side of overcrossing), replacing the existing Genessee Avenue overcrossing with a higher, wider (124 foot) structure and replacing the existing Miramar Road bridge with a longer, wider (60 foot) structure. The project also includes the modification of existing ramps and the construction of new loop ramps and auxiliary lanes on both sides of the freeway.

Justification: This project is needed to improve traffic flow and is included in the Council-approved North University City Community Financing Plan and Facilities Benefit Assessment Document.

Scheduling: Design is scheduled in FY 1991 - FY 1992; land acquisition in FY 1993; construction is scheduled to begin in FY 1994 and be completed in FY 1996.

Relationship to General and Community Plans: This project is consistent with the University Community Plan and the City's General Plan Guidelines.

Operating Budget Effect: None.

CIP No. 52-172.0
April 8, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

The Division of Rail and the Division of Mass Transportation have received the Revised Notice of Participation of Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor.

Our comments on these projects will be coordinated by, and forwarded to you through our San Diego district office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JOHN JAMES, Chief
Projects - South Branch

Rec'd
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24 April 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

SUBJECT: REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) FOR EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES: MID-COAST TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (SCH 90011025)

The City of San Diego's Environmental Analysis Section of the Planning Department has reviewed the revised NOP for the EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation regarding the Mid-Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis. The Environmental Analysis Section has no new comments; please see our comments dated 26 November 1990 (attached).

Thank you for providing the Planning Department with this opportunity to participate in MTDB's environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Ann B. Hix, Principal Planner
City Planning Department

ABH:ML:LAL

Attachment: Planning Department comment letter dated 26 November 1990

cc: Thomas T. Story
    Linda Johnson
    Mary Lee Balko
    Mary Ladiana
    Laura A. Loop

4-29-91
26 November 1990

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation for the EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation regarding transportation issues. The City of San Diego offers the following comments on the NOP:

GENERAL COMMENTS

Assembly Bill 3180 (Cortese) which was effectuated on January 1, 1989, requires public agencies to "adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment". The reporting program should be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Written documentation is required, preferably in environmental reports and in permits. The DEIR should include and reference a mitigation monitoring program for any mitigation measures identified in the DEIR.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

EARTH

The project boundary traverses the Rose Canyon Fault and is in very close proximity to the Carmel Valley, Torrey Pines and Mount Soledad Faults. The close proximity to the aforementioned faults and their effect on the proposed project should be addressed in the DEIR.

AIR

The City concurs with your statements that: "the alternatives
under construction should reduce the number of cars on the road, therefore, overall ambient air quality should be improved"; and "in local areas where LRT stations are proposed, some microscale degradation of air quality could exist...due to automobiles ingressing/egressing park-and-ride areas".

The 1989 California Clean Air Act requires that the revised strategy for smog, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide must be submitted to the California Air Resource Board (ARB) by mid-1991. Currently, San Diego County does not meet or attain Federal standards for smog and carbon monoxide, nor State standards for smog, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and inhalable particles. Population growth and resulting increases in traffic have begun to overcome ongoing reductions in emissions.

In 1989 the City Council adopted an ordinance for the implementation of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. This program requires City-wide employers, building owners and developers to implement strategies designed to reduce peak hour vehicle trips and work towards meeting Federal and State mandated clean air standards. The DEIR should address how the proposed LRT and alternatives could reduce local San Diego air pollution and achieve Federal and State mandated air quality goals by reducing emissions from vehicles used for commuting between the home and the worksite.

The DEIR should address whether the proposed project and alternatives affect the ability of the revised Regional Air Quality Strategy to meet the Federal clean air standards? More specifically:

Does the proposed project incorporate necessary improvements to the traffic signal operation located in the vicinity of the proposed LRT stations to achieve a Level of Service C or above?

Does the proposed project incorporate bicycle parking facilities at the proposed LRT stations?

Bus transit alternatives would operate on diesel power and increase the emissions of diesel fume particles and hydrocarbons. Buses generated by an alternative form of energy, such as electricity or gasohol, should be considered. These forms of energy could lower the emission levels of pollutants.

WATER

The proposed LRT has the potential to disrupt the flow rate and increase siltation in the San Diego River; Rose, San Clemente, Tecolote and Penasquitos Creeks; and other drainage ways in the corridor vicinity. The DEIR should also address parking lot runoff and its impact on watersheds and drainage ways. On-site infiltration of stormwater into the ground is one of the most
effective ways to reduce the quantity of stormwater runoff. Limiting the proportion of the site covered by impervious surfaces would help to ensure on-site infiltration. Impervious surfaces, such as parking lots, not only increase the amount of runoff from a site, but they also produce runoff that contains petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants.

PLANT LIFE

See above comment regarding parking lot runoff.

Since a large portion of the LRT alignments follow existing railroad and freeway rights-of-way, it could be anticipated that construction of the alternatives would not adversely disturb the diversity or numbers of plant species. However, disturbance could occur during construction of the rail in areas where a right-of-way is not in existence. All disturbed areas should be landscaped with native species. Both a mitigation monitoring and maintenance program and a revegetation plan should be included in the DEIR.

NOISE

Would sound attenuation walls be required for residences adjacent to the railroad tracks? If needed, design and grading for these walls should be addressed at this stage of the DEIR.

LIGHT AND GLARE

Street and parking lot lights must comply with the City’s Light Pollution Law (Section 101.1300 of the Municipal Code). Also, consideration should be given to solar generated parking lot lighting.

POPULATION/LAND USE

Although neither the construction nor the operation of any alternative is considered growth-inducing in terms of attracting population from outside the region, the proposed project may encourage clustering of residential and commercial nodes around the transportation stations. The DEIR should determine whether this would result in a substantial alteration to existing or planned land uses in the area.

ENERGY

See comment regarding alternative forms of energy for mass transit under AIR.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The proposed project's effect on cultural resources is unknown until site testing is completed, therefore, the EIR should
address whether the proposed project would impact cultural resources including religious or sacred use areas.

We look forward to reviewing the EIR/EIS. Please provide a copy to our office for our review and comment. If you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact Laura Loop at 236-6650.

Sincerely,

Mary Indiana

Ann B. Hix, Principal Planner
City Planning Department

ML:LAL

cc: Thomas T. Story
    Linda Johnson
    Mary Lee Balko
    Mary Ladiana
    Laura A. Loop
April 25, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

This is in response to MTDB's revised NOP of EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation regarding Transportation Issues: Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor (SCH # 90011025).

We have reviewed the material submitted and the staff would be concerned with safety issues arising from having a transit line operating adjacent to a railroad line. This would include the pedestrians coming to and from the proposed transit facility; the additional vehicular traffic traversing the grade crossings next to any proposed transit station; possible blocking of grade crossings by LRVs stopped at the LR station; and the added or additional noise from the LRVs. We believe all of the above items, in addition to the proposed need to improve the grade crossing warning devices along the proposed transit line, should be considered and addressed in any EIR/EIS prepared.

If we can be of further help, please feel free to contact the staff.

Sincerely,

Tack S. Joe, Transportation Engineer
Special Projects Section
Railroad Safety Branch
Safety Division

cc: Clearinghouse
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April 25, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

SUBJECT: REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTANT REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES: MID-COAST TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (SCH90011025)

Dear Dennis:

The Department of Planning and Land Use is supportive of the goals of Metropolitan Transit Development Board of expanding the light rail transit lines. Light rail transit can play a substantial role in reducing congestion, improving air quality and concentrating land uses.

Our specific comments are that the lines will transverse steep topography, including canyons, steep slopes and drainages adjoining I-5 along the eastern boundary north of the junction of I-805. Please address the project impacts relating to landform transformation, grading and erosion, visual impacts, and losses or degradation of riparian or coastal sage scrub wildlife habitat.

For additional information, please contact Jim Lundquist at 694-3724.

Sincerely,

LAUREN M. WASSERMAN, Director
Department of Planning and Land Use

LMW:JL:jb

AUTHOR\CWLTRJL.491
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April 18, 1991

Dennis Wahl, Project Manager
MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA  92101-7490

Dear Dennis:

On Tuesday, April 16, the Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee discussed possible impacts of the proposed Light Rail Transit extension through the mid-coast corridor. The committee recommended by unanimous vote that the following specific issues should be focused on and addressed in any impact reports prepared.

1. VISUAL IMPACTS OF STATIONS AND ELECTRICAL POLES ON SURROUNDING VIEWS. Possible suggestions include design, placement and screening of wires, track and poles to minimize negative impact.

2. IMPACTS IN RELATION TO PARKING AT TERMINALS. Security measures for parked cars should be addressed, and also the impact of increased street-side parking in commercial and residential areas near stations. An additional suggestion is to press for the Clairemont Drive station to be a park-and-ride facility.

3. TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION IMPACTS. Specifically address traffic on Balboa Avenue and Morena Boulevard, as well as their feeder streets. Include in this analysis the effects on peak traffic hours. Additionally address impacts on circulation due to increased bus service on Milton and other streets near terminals. We suggest viewing a new alignment of a westbound on Balboa to northbound on Interstate 5 as a way to ease problems at the proposed Balboa station. We further suggest that MTDB work to coordinate efforts with other governmental agencies during planning and construction. Examples of this coordination include a future widening of Balboa Avenue, and future underground work along Morena Boulevard.

4. NOISE IMPACTS. Include possible noise impacts from both trains and from feeder buses to and from the stations.

Rec'd 4-22-91
5. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO TERMINALS: On all stations placed west of Morena, the issue of safe and convenient pedestrian access across Morena must be addressed.

6. LIGHT AND GLARE IMPACTS. Address the problem of light placement in order to minimize glare on nearby residential areas.

Please keep us well informed of your progress, and do not hesitate to contact the planning committee for further input or information. If you have any questions, please contact Russell Heilig at 583-4040.

Thank you for consideration.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Russell T. Heilig
Transportation Sub-committee
Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee

cc. Councilman Bruce Henderson
   Councilman Tom Behr
   City Manager's Office
   Rick Pilgrim, MTDB
   Tim Graves, CMPC

PO Box 17204
SD 92117
April 23, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
Metropolitan Development
Transit Board
1255 Imperial Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Subject: Revised Notice of Preparation of EIR/EIS and Notice of Consultation Regarding Transportation Issues - Mid-coast Transportation Corridor

We have completed our review of the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation for the subject project.

In Section 16, "UTILITIES," your Notice of Preparation states, in part, that the proposal might result in "Some relocation of utilities..." including water, sewer and/or septic tanks. From the material in your notice, we cannot determine the impact of your project on our existing utilities.

Please provide us with the preliminary right-of-way drawings when they become available.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

LEONARD L. WILSON
Senior Civil Engineer

cc: R. Graff
    K. Ghaderi
Mr. Dennis Wahl  
MTDB  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

April 26, 1991

Dear Mr. Wahl:

SUBJECT: REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF EIR/EIS AND NOTICE OF CONSULTATION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION ISSUES: MID-COAST TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (SCH90011025)

We have completed our review of the revised Notice of Preparation and Notice of Consultation for the subject project. We have obtained and reviewed preliminary drawings for the future LRT improvements.

Along the South Segment alignment, Old Town Station to Gilman Drive, the Water Utilities Department has prepared plans for construction of the Morena Boulevard Interceptor, a 72-inch diameter gravity sewer. The alignment runs generally north-south, abutting the parallel to the AT&SF railroad tracks along Santa Fe Street and Morena Boulevard. The impacts of the future LRT improvements, if any, on this sewer line should be evaluated closely and mitigated accordingly.

Along the Center Segment alignment, Gilman Drive to Genesee Avenue, Water Utilities Department is working on final design plans for construction of the Rose Canyon Trunk Sewer, a 60-inch diameter dual purpose gravity/forcemain sewer. In the vicinity of our project, the Mid-Coast LRT Alignment is proposed to be located along the west side of the AT&SF railway tracks. Our proposed utility bridge at Rose Creek crossing appears to be at a sufficient distance from the planned LRT bridge. However, one area of potential conflict between our pipeline has been identified. That area is located north of Highway 52 and south of Gilman Drive.
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Additionally, mitigation measures should be provided, if necessary, for stray current protection generated by operations of the future trolley lines as this might detrimentally affect our water and sewer facilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. For any additional information, please call me at 533-5110.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
AFSHIN OSKOUI
Senior Civil Engineer

AO: nm

cc: R. Graff
K. Ghaderi
May 1, 1991

Mr. Dennis Wahl
San Diego MTDB
1255 Imperial Avenue
San Diego, California 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Wahl:

We have reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a draft Environmental Impact Report for the San Diego MTDB Regional Light Rail Transit, SCH90011025. To enable our staff to adequately review and comment on this project, we recommend the following information be included in the Draft EIR:

1. A complete assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened and locally unique species and sensitive and critical habitats.

2. A discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts.

3. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from any increased runoff, sedimentation, soil erosion, and/or urban pollutants on streams and watercourses on or near the project site, with mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such impacts. Stream buffer areas and maintenance in their natural condition through non-structural flood control methods should also be considered in order to continue their high value as wildlife corridors.

More generally, there should be discussion of alternatives to not only minimize adverse impacts to wildlife, but to include direct benefit to wildlife and wildlife habitat. Those discussions should consider the Department of Fish and Game's policy that there should be no net loss of wetland acreage or habitat values. We oppose projects which do not provide adequate mitigation for such losses.
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Diversion, obstruction of the natural flow, or changes in the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake will require notification to the Department of Fish and Game as called for in the Fish and Game Code. Notification should be made after the project is approved by the lead agency.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Kris Lal of our Environmental Services staff at (213) 590-5137.

Sincerely,

Fred Worthley
Regional Manager
Region 5

cc: Office of Planning & Research
May 8, 1991

11-SD-005
R019.0-R034.1

Dennis Wahl
MTDB
FAX (619) 234-3407

Dear Mr. Wahl:

Revised Notice of Preparation of an EIR/EIS
for the Mid-Coast Transportation Corridor -
SCH 90011025

Caltrans District 11 looks forward to the opportunity to review the referenced EIR/EIS. We note that the revisions are necessary because the UCSD/Gilman Drive LRT alternative has been dropped and a new LRT alternative along Genesee Avenue has been added. Our comments on the NOP/NOI are as follows:

1. **Aesthetics** - We are concerned that the grading and walls for the transportation improvement alternatives may conflict with our proposed visual mitigations for the Interstate Route 5 widening project and State Route 56. Also, we will be interested in the preservation of existing views of East Mission Bay Park from Interstate 5.

2. **Biology/Recreation** - The preferred LRT alignment and station site (Map 2) has the potential for significantly degrading the viability of the Interstate 5/State 56 biological mitigations site in Carmel Valley. The planned Carmel Valley Restoration and Enhancement Project, CVREP, includes biological mitigations and riding and hiking trails.

Our initial contact person for interagency coordination and traffic information is Richard Coward, Project Manager, Project Services Branch, (619) 688-3303.

Sincerely,

JESUS M. GARCIA
District Director

JAMES T. CHEHIRE, Chief
Environmental Planning Branch
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APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY

ACCESS TIME
The time required to walk or drive from the origin of the trip (for example, from home) to a (boarding) transit stop, plus the waiting time based on the frequency of transit service, the transfer time, and the walking or driving time from the transit (deboarding) stop to the destination. For auto trips, it is the time required to walk to and from parking places and delays within parking lots.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
The systematic study of alternative alignments in a transit corridor to determine the best according to a predetermined set of criteria. A formalized Alternatives Analysis has historically been performed in conjunction with an Environmental Impact Statement as part of the process necessary to obtain federal funding for a transit project. In late 1993, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) jointly issued new planning regulations for major transportation investment analysis to be used to determine whether a project should be funded. This project follows the historic FTA process which includes Alternatives Analysis.

ANNUALIZED CAPITAL COST
A onetime capital cost converted into an annual value which incorporates both the depreciation on the capital item and the foregone interests on the money invested in the project.

ARTERIAL ROADWAY
A roadway with partial control of access, with some at-grade intersections, intended to move high volumes of traffic over longer distances and higher speeds than secondary roadways.

ARTICULATED VEHICLE
A bus or rail vehicle that is jointed in a fashion to allow the vehicle to bend when it turns corners. Passenger access is usually allowed across the joint. Articulation allows longer vehicles to turn in a shorter radius, and thus negotiate tighter curves than would be possible if they were not articulated.

AT-GRADE
On the ground surface, or on that surface at which significant pedestrian and vehicular traffic occurs.

AT-GRADE CROSSING
Crossing lines of traffic that share a common intersection.

AVERAGE RIDE TIME
Average riding time spent by passengers during one trip.

AVERAGE SPEED
The average velocity of a vehicle from stop or station to the next stop or station, beginning with door opening and ending with door opening.
AVERAGE WAIT TIME
Average time spent by passengers in the station (or stop) in waiting for transit service.

BELOW-GRADE
Placed below the ground surface, as with a subway.

BOARDING TRIPS
Number of trips boarding (entering) transit vehicles, regardless of whether the trip involves a transfer from another transit vehicle. Equivalent to unlinked trips. Depending on whether a transfer is used, a fare may or may not be collected for each boarding trip.

CAPITAL COSTS
Nonrecurring costs required to construct transit systems, including costs of right-of-way, facilities, vehicle power distribution, associated administrative and design costs, and financing charges during construction.

COLLECTOR STREETS
Streets upon which traffic in a particular neighborhood flows to exit or enter the neighborhood.

CONSIST
The number of transit vehicles forming a train.

CONTRA-FLOW LANE
A lane on a highway or street specifically designated for vehicles traveling against the normal traffic flow.

CORE SERVICE AREA
The hub of a radial transit system, where many of the routes converge. Usually located in the CBD.

CORRIDOR
A smaller area within the service area that is determined to have a unique set of travel characteristics, and which is best served by transit when considered as a whole.

CRUSH PASSENGER LOAD
The maximum physical capacity of a rail vehicle under overload conditions -- about 1.5 square feet of gross floor area per passenger.

DEADHEAD TIME
The time during which a vehicle is not available.

dBA
Abbreviation for decibels of sound pressure as read on the "A" scale.

DESIGN LOAD
Maximum design weight of a vehicle or structure, including a crush passenger load.

DISTRIBUTION
The process of letting passengers off at a number of different locations.
EMISSION CONTROL
Method by which emissions are governed in an effort to minimize the amount of pollutants and/or the noise emitted.

EMISSIONS
Particulate, gaseous, noise, or electromagnetic by-products of the transit system or vehicle.

END TERMINAL
A transit station located at the end of a transit line.

ENERGY CONSUMPTION (EMPTY)
The energy consumed by a transit vehicle under normal operation with no passengers or cargo carried.

ENERGY CONSUMPTION (FULL)
The energy consumed by a transit vehicle under normal operation carrying its design load (i.e. design capacity and not crush capacity).

ENVELOPE
Definition of the vertical and horizontal space required for the transit vehicle and/or the guideway.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
A study analyzing the potential effects of an action (e.g., building a rail station) to the surrounding area. Elements of the environment typically examined include noise and vibration levels, air and water quality, community disruptions, construction impacts, and so forth.

EQUILIBRATION
The process of balancing proposed amounts of transit service with projected ridership levels.

EXCLUSIVE GUIDEWAY (DEDICATED)
A guideway or roadway to be used only for transit vehicles. It is usually completely grade-separated from other types of vehicles.

EXPRESS SERVICE
Transit service where a very limited number of stops are made enroute.

FARE STRUCTURE
The methodology of determining the fare that a passenger pays for service.

FEEDER SERVICE
Local transit service that feeds some other (usually faster and higher capacity) transit service.

FISCAL YEAR (FY)
October 1 to September 30; used for accounting purposes and further divided into three-month quarters.

FREQUENCY, VEHICLE
Rate of vehicle arrivals at a station or stop along a transit line (e.g., six per hour).
GRADE
The degrees of incline or decline from horizontal; the amount of steepness of a particular portion of an alignment. Usually measured in percent.

GRADE-SEPARATED
Crossing lines of traffic are vertically separated from each other.

GUIDEWAY
Specifically designed path for transit vehicles. It usually contains the vehicles by providing vertical support and lateral guidance. Railroad track and ballast are typically used a guideway for LRT vehicles.

HEADWAY
The time interval between identical points on successive vehicles passing the same point along the way (e.g., 10-minute headways). The frequency of service on a particular route or line.

HOME-BASED WORK (HBW) TRIPS
Work trips having either origin or destination at the home.

HOV
High Occupancy Vehicle. A car, van, or bus used to carry a large number of persons per trip. Cars or vans are considered HOV’s if they are being used by a carpool.

HOV LANE
A lane of a highway or street specifically designated for buses or HOV vehicles.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER MODES
Method by which a transit system user transfers to other modes of transportation.

INTERCHANGE
They system of interconnecting ramps between two or more intersecting roadways or guideways that are grade-separated.

KISS-AND-RAISE SPACES
A short-term automobile parking area for passenger pick-up and drop-off, usually located near a station or stop for convenient access to the transit system.

L eq
Energy equivalent hour. Used in measuring noise levels.

LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)
A measure of traffic flow that ranges from a letter designation of "A" through "F". "A" denotes free flowing traffic conditions with no delays, "F" denotes substantial traffic congestion with excessive delays.

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT (LRT)
Transit mode characterized by an overhead electric power source, and by its ability to operate in both an at-grade and/or a grade-separated environment, and usually operating in one, two, or three vehicle consists.
LINE HAUL
A transit system that offers service along a line or corridor with relatively few stops (see also Feeder Service). (An LRT line operating with stations spaced at least one mile apart would be an example of line haul service.)

LINE MILE
Unduplicated miles of rail line, regardless of the number of tracks.

LINK
A representative portion of a transportation network which joins two modes.

LINKED TRIPS
Total passenger trips excluding transfers. The number of linked trips is always less than or equal to the number of unlinked (boarding) trips.

LOCAL SERVICE
A type of operation involving frequent stops and consequent low speeds, in order to pick up and deliver transit passengers as close to their origins or destinations as possible.

MINIMUM OPERABLE SEGMENT (MOS)
Shorter alternatives that preserve a high level of transit ridership, yet reduce construction costs and (in some cases) environmental impacts.

MINIMUM TURN RADIUS
The minimum horizontal turning circle of a vehicle.

MODAL SPLIT
The proportioning of trips between travel modes, such as the proportion of automobile versus transit trips.

MODE
A particular form or method of travel distinguished by vehicle type, operation technology, and right-of-way separation from other traffic.

MODEL
Transportation models are computerized procedures for predicting changes in travel patterns in response to changes in development patterns, transportation systems, and demographics given certain assumptions about travel behavior based on existing conditions.

MONORAIL
A guideway where vehicle vertical support and lateral guidance are provided by a single track or rail.

NETWORK
A system of real or hypothetical interconnecting lines within a transportation model that form the configuration of transit routes and stops constituting a total transportation system.
NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE
The baseline alternative of not making any changes to the existing transit system and roadway network, except for those changes already programmed. It is used as a baseline against which the other proposed alternatives are compared.

NORMAL PASSENGER LOAD
Typically one standing rider for each seated rider. This is about 2.4 square feet of gross floor area per passenger.

OFF-PEAK
Those periods of the day where demand for transit service is not at a maximum.

ONE-WAY VOLUME
The number of vehicles or passengers travelling in a single direction on a rail alignment or roadway.

OPERATING COSTS
Recurring costs of operating transit systems. These costs include wages and salaries, maintenance of facilities and equipment, fuel, supplies, employee benefits, insurance, taxes, and other administrative costs. The amortization of facilities and equipment is not included.

OPERATING REVENUE
The gross income from the operation of the transit system, including fares, charter income, concessions, advertising, etc. Does not include interest from securities, nonrecurring income from sale of capital assets, and so forth.

PARK-AND-RIDE LOT
The transfer point of an intermodal trip where the driver of an automobile parks the automobile and changes to either bus or rail transit.

PATRONAGE (RIDERS)
The number of person-trips carried by a transit system during a specified period.

PEAK HOUR
The hour of the day in which the maximum demand for service is experienced.

PEAK PERIOD
A specified period for which the volume of traffic is greater than that during any other similar period (i.e., peak hour, peak five minutes, etc.).

PERSON-TRIP
A trip made by a person by any travel mode.

REVENUE SERVICE
The time during which a transit vehicle is in service and is available to passengers for transportation. It is expressed in terms of car-miles or car-hours for rail technology and in vehicle-miles or vehicle-hours for buses.
RIGHT-OF-WAY
The horizontal and vertical space occupied by an alignment, which a transit authority has control over, either through outright ownership, lease agreement, or an easement.

ROUTE MILES
The length of an LRT alignment or bus route measured in miles between its end points.

SECONDARY ROADWAYS
Streets on which traffic flows to pass from one neighborhood to another.

SERVICE AND INSPECTION (S&I) FACILITY
A yard and shop where LRT vehicles are routinely cleaned, inspected and serviced. Major maintenance operations are performed at the Vehicle Assembly Site/Major Maintenance Facility (VAS/MMF).

TERMINAL
The end station or stop of transportation routes of one or more modes. Transfer facilities and amenities are often provided.

TERMINAL TIME
The part of the total travel time required to gain access to the principal travel mode or the time spent in reaching the destination after departing the principal travel mode.

THEORETICAL HEADWAY
The closest time interval in which two successive vehicles may safely operate along a section of a transit line.

TOTAL TRAVEL TIME
The total elapsed time between trip beginning and end. It includes travel, transfer, and waiting time.

TRANSFER
The portion of a trip a transit patron makes as he or she changes from one connecting route to another in order to complete his or her trip.

TRANSFER TIME
The elapsed trip time required to change between modes or to transfer between routes of the same mode.

TRANSIT
A transportation system principally for moving people in an urban area and made available to the public usually through paying a fare. Typical vehicles used for transit include buses, rail cars, and other fixed guideway vehicles.

TRANSITWAY MALL (LRT AND BUS)
A downtown area consisting of streets redesigned to allow higher performance transit service. Except for necessary local and emergency access, through automobile and truck traffic is restricted. Pedestrian amenities, such as wider sidewalks and benches, are incorporated into the design.
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (TSM)
A set of transit service improvement options that generally includes lower-cost projects to improve the existing transportation highway or transit network.

TRAVEL TIME
The time required to travel between two points (excluding access time or waiting time).

TRIP
The one-way movement of one person between origin and destination, including the walk to and from the means of transportation.

TRIPS, NON-HOME-BASED
Trips having neither origin or destination at the home.

UNLINKED TRIPS - (See BOARDING TRIPS).

VANPOOL
A carpool that uses a van instead of a passenger automobile.

VEHICLE ASSEMBLY SITE/MAJOR MAINTENANCE FACILITY (VAS/MMF)
Building and track area used both for assembling LRT vehicles and buses when they are delivered from the manufacturer, and for major maintenance tasks on the vehicles. Routing cleaning and maintenance operations are performed at the S&I Facility.

VEHICLE DESIGN LIFE
The lifetime for which a vehicle is designed, after which replacement can be considered.

WAITING TIME
The part of the total travel time required for the transit vehicle to arrive, after the patron arrives at the station or stop.
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LIST OF PREPARERS

PUBLIC AGENCIES

FTA. Federal Agency responsible for DEIS/DEIR. Key personnel include:

Washington, D.C.

Donald J. Emerson, Chief, Planning Analysis and Support Division, Office of Planning
- Master of Urban Affairs, Virginia Tech
- B.S., Civil Engineering; Tufts University

Ron Jensen-Fisher, Analyst, Office of Planning
- M.S., Civil Engineering; University of Washington
- B.S., Physics; Rose Polytechnic Institute

Sheila Cohen, Planner, Planning Analysis and Support Division, Office of Planning
- B.A., Geography, George Mason University

Edward Thomas, Chief, Capital Development Division, Office of Mobility Enhancement
- M.S., Transportation Planning; Columbia University
- B.S., Geography; University of Maryland

Anthony J. Ossi, Environmental Protection Specialist, Office of Planning
- B.A., Rutgers University

Ken Mowll, Senior Community Planner
- B.A., International Affairs
- Graduate Studies in Geography and Economics

San Francisco

Robert E. Hom, Program Manager, Office of Program Management, Region IX
- M.B.A., San Francisco State University
- M.S.C.E., Engineering; University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineering
- B.S., Civil Engineering; University of Connecticut
- Professional Engineer in California

Denver

Louis F. Mraz, Jr., Western Area Director
- M.S., Engineering; University of California, Berkeley
- B.S., Civil Engineering; University of Connecticut
- Professional Engineer in Connecticut
Metropolitan Transit Development Board, San Diego, California. Local agency for project. Key personnel include:

Thomas F. Larwin, General Manager
- B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Illinois
- M.E. Civil Engineering, Pennsylvania State University

Dennis J. Wahl, Project Manager, Senior Transportation Planner
- B.A. Public Administration, San Diego State University
- Master of City Planning, San Diego State University

William Lieberman, Director of Planning and Operations
- M.A. Regional Planning, University of North Carolina

Rick Thorpe, Director of Engineering and Construction
- B.S. Civil Engineering, San Diego State University
- M.S. Civil Engineering, San Diego State University

Robert Robenhymer, Principal Planner
- B.S. Civil Engineering, University of Rhode Island

William C. Lorenz, Light Rail Transit Engineer
- B.S. Civil Engineering, Washington University of St. Louis

Xavier Estrada, Senior Construction Engineer
- B.S. Civil Engineering, University of Texas El Paso

*Chris Rychel, Senior Transportation Engineer
- B. S. Civil Engineering, San Diego State University

*Tony Mendoza, Transportation Planner
- B.A. Public Administration, San Diego State University

California Department of Transportation, District 11, San Diego, California

Tim Vasquez, Environmental Branch Chief
- 21 years environmental analysis experience

Susan Glasgow, Document Oversight
- B.A., Geography, San Diego State University
- 18 years Caltrans experience.

Bob Avilla, Air and Noise Study Engineer
- 15 years Caltrans experience.

Carlos Cortez, Transportation Engineer
- B.S. Civil Engineering, San Diego State University
John Rieger, Associate Environmental Planner
    - B.S. Zoology, M.S. Biology, San Diego State University;
    - Certificate in Wildlife Biology;

Tina Robinson, Socioeconomic Oversight, Associate Environmental Planner
    - B.S. Life Sciences, M.A. Finance, The University of California at Davis

Marty Rosen, Associate Environmental Planner, Specializing in Archeology
    - B.A. and M.A. in Anthropology, U.C.L.A.

Ray Traynor, Associate Landscape Architect
    - B.S. Landscape Architecture, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

Gary Vetteese, Senior Transportation Engineer
    - B.S. Civil Engineering, Rutgers University

CONSULTANTS

General Environmental Planning Consultant to MTDB

Helene B. Komblatt
    - Review, Quality Control, General Assistance
    - M.A., UCLA, Environmental Planning and Management

Consulting Environmental Attorney

Chris Garrett, Latham and Watkins
    - Review, Quality Control, General Assistance
    - B.A., Political Science, Northwestern University
    - J.D., Northwestern University

Prime Consultant

BRW, Inc.

Nathaniel Behura, Transportation Engineer
    - Traffic and Air Quality Analysis
    - M.B.A., UCLA (Currently Enrolled)
    - M.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering, Vanderbilt University
    - B.S., Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology

Matthew W. Burt, Transportation Planner
    - Traffic and Air Quality Analysis
    - M.A., Urban and Regional Planning, University of Iowa
    - B.S.S., Sociology, Cornell University

Melissa J. Patrizi, Graphic Designer
    - Technical Graphics
    - Undergraduate Studies Graphic Design/Business, Illinois State University
* Walter G. Stringer, Transit Planner
  - Transit Operations/Land Use and Economic Development Analyses
  - M.B.A., San Francisco State University
  - B.Sc., Transportation, University of Tennessee

* Ann Uyeda, Transportation Planner
  - Land Use and Economic Analyses
  - B.A., American Studies, University of California, Fullerton

Daniel T. Mayers, Traffic Engineer
  - Traffic Impact Analysis
  - M.Sc., Urban Planning, University of Michigan
  - Certificate in Transportation Engineering, University of Michigan
  - B.Sc., Urban Studies, Elmhurst College
  - B.A., Political Science, Elmhurst College

William D. Byrne, Vice President
  - Patronage Analysis
  - M.Sc., Civil Engineering, Stanford University
  - B.Sc., Civil Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Richard D. Pilgrim, Vice President
  - Project Manager
  - Graduate Studies, Business Administration, University of Colorado
  - B.Sc., Engineering, Colorado State University

Dennis Landall, Transportation Engineer
  - Alternatives Design, Cost Estimates
  - B.Sc., Civil Engineering, University of Minnesota

William D. Burgel, Manager Railway Engineering
  - Tunnel Design Cost Estimates
  - B.S., Engineering, University of Michigan
  - M.S., Geology, Idaho State University

SUBCONSULTANTS

ICF Kaiser Engineers, Inc.

Stephen Beard, Vice President
  - Manager, Environmental Planning
  - M.S., Transportation Planning, Florida State University
  - B.S., Aviation Management, Auburn University

Marc Soronson, Principal Planner
  - Environmental Planning Documentation
  - M.U.P., Urban Planning, University of Michigan
  - B.S., Political Science/Urban Affairs, The American University
Jerri Horst, Senior Planner
- Environmental Planning Documentation
- M.A., Environmental Planning, Governors State University
- B.S., Agriculture, University of Arizona

Robert Woolery, Civil Engineer
- Engineering
- B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Arizona

*Roberto Conrique, Project Manager
- Engineering
- National Civil Engineering, University of Mexico

*George L. Piantka, Chemist
- Hazardous Materials
- B.S., Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley

James Hinshaw, Graphics Coordinator
- Technical Graphics
- B.F.A., Graphic Design

*Linda Fraser, Office Administrator
- Word Processing

Pat Siewert, Office Administrator
- Word Processing

Robin Lloyd, Secretary
- Word Processing

Manuel Padron & Associates

Manuel Padron, Principal
- Operations and Maintenance Planning
- M.A., City and Regional Planning, Syracuse University
- B.A., Civil Engineering

John Mason, Planner
- Operations and Maintenance Planning
- M.A., Civil Engineering, Northwestern University
- B.A., Civil Engineering, University of Illinois

Dennis Markham, Associate
- Operations Planning, O & M Costs
- MBA, University of California, Berkeley, 1986
- BA, Economics-Business, University of California, Los Angeles, 1984
Kawasaki/Theilacker/Ueno+Associates

R. Brad Lewis, Landscape Architect
- Visual Assessment
- B.S. Landscape Architecture, California Polytechnic State University

Michael L. Singleton, Landscape Architect
- Visual Assessment
- B.S. Landscape Architecture, California Polytechnic State University

Sharon Singleton, Landscape Architect
- Visual Assessment
- B.S. Landscape Architecture, California Polytechnic State University

Fraser Engineering

Graham T. Fraser, Principal
- Water Resources/Geotechnical Assessment
- M.S., Environmental Engineering, University of Western Ontario
- B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Sydney

Michael Boraks, Civil Engineer
- Water Resources/Geotechnical Assessment
- B.S., Civil Engineering, Villanova University

Geocon, Inc.

David J. Corley
- Geotechnical Assessment
- M.S., Civil Engineering, San Diego State
- B.S., Petroleum Engineering, Louisiana State University

Steven Greenfield
- Geotechnical Assessment
- M.S., Engineering, University of California, Davis
- B.S., Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara

Dudek and Associates, Inc.

Harold Weir, Manager Biological Sciences
- Biological Resources Assessment
- B.S., Botany, San Diego State
Ogden Environmental

Jeanne Munoz, Cultural Resources Manager
  - Cultural Resources Assessment
  - Ph.D., Anthropology, University of California, Riverside
  - M.A., Anthropology, California State University, Long Beach

Andrew Pigniolo, Project Anthropologist
  - Cultural Resources Assessment
  - M.A., Anthropology, San Diego State University
  - B.A., Anthropology, San Diego State University

* No longer employed by firm.
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COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION

D.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Active public involvement is critical to the success of any project with significant impact on the community. The process should ensure that critical community concerns and technical issues are identified early in the study and addressed in the engineering, environmental, economic, and financial analyses, so that the alternatives and ultimately the locally preferred alternative effectively respond to community needs and preferences and satisfy local, State, and federal environmental clearance requirements.

D.1.1 Public Involvement Program

The public involvement program for the San Diego Mid-Coast Corridor Study has consisted of five different elements. They include:

- Project sponsors;
- Community participation;
- Scoping meetings and public meetings;
- Public information program; and
- Public involvement program.

A description of each follows.

D.1.2 Project Sponsors

The local project sponsor, the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board and the California Department of Transportation, have agreed to participate financially, technically, and at a policy level in the development of improved public transit in the San Diego metropolitan area. At the federal level, the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration are the prime participants in the study. In addition, a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed during the study to discuss and provide input on key policy matters relating to the study. The committee is comprised of representatives from the MTDB, City of San Diego, County of San Diego, SANDAG, California Department of Transportation, neighborhood groups, and the University of California, San Diego.

D.1.3 Community Participation

To facilitate the community participation, a list of individuals, agencies, and organizations was developed which included persons who had indicated an interest in transportation planning projects during previous public information efforts and focused to the Mid-Coast Corridor. Project information and response forms were distributed to these persons following public meetings and workshops in order to solicit comments and recommendations.

D.1.4 Public Meetings

Two formal scoping meetings were held on April 26, 1990. These meetings were announced, in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations, in the Federal Register Vol. 55, No. 70, April 11, 1990, in local publications, and all persons and organizations on the project mailing list were
notified. A summary report including meeting minutes, significant findings and comments, and a list of attendees was prepared and distributed. This report is available for review at the MTDB offices.

D.1.5 Public Information Program

During the Mid-Coast Corridor Study the public information program was established to educate the community of factors related to transportation planning and the Mid-Coast Corridor Study. The focus of the program was to provide information in order assist the MTDB in making decisions.

The public information program is distinguished from the rest of the public involvement program in that its activities are designed primarily to inform the public and not necessarily to elicit interaction. The information program included briefings for the new media, informational meetings, presentations to include community and professional associations and educational institutions, and public forums.

Informational Meetings

A series of presentations to individual community and professional associations and neighborhood groups was conducted over a 2-year period during the study process. There were approximately 85 presentations given to organizations such as Citizen Advisory Committees, Neighborhood Boards, Lions Clubs, Rotary Clubs, developer organizations, etc.

D.1.6 Public Involvement

Public involvement was structured to permit both active, continuous participation and informal dialogues to ensure a maximum exchange of information and concerns. Both formal and informal information and scoping meetings were held during the entire study timeframe.

Following completion and FTA acceptance of the Detailed Definition of Alternatives report, a public information meeting was held. The purpose of this meeting was to report to the community on the status and progress of the Mid-Coast Corridor AA/DEIS/DEIR.

D.1.7 Schedule of Community Coordination Activities

A schedule of all community coordination activities is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 1989</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 1990</td>
<td>North City Transportation Association (TMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1990</td>
<td>University Community Planning Group (UCPG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 1990</td>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1990</td>
<td>Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 1990</td>
<td>UCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 1990</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1990</td>
<td>North City TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1990</td>
<td>MTD Board - Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1990</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1990</td>
<td>UCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 1990</td>
<td>MTD Board - Status/Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 1990</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 1990</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 1990</td>
<td>MTD Board - Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 1990</td>
<td>North City TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 1990</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 1991</td>
<td>UCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 1991</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 1991</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 1991</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 1991</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1991</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 1991</td>
<td>UCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Alignments and Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1991</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Tour w/citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 1991</td>
<td>APA Luncheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1991</td>
<td>La Jolla Colony Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 1991</td>
<td>UCPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Terminal Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 1991</td>
<td>City of San Diego Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3, 1991</td>
<td>UCPG Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 1991</td>
<td>North City TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Alignments/Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 1991</td>
<td>Olis Hill/TRW Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 1991</td>
<td>Press Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 1991</td>
<td>Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 1991</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 1992</td>
<td>North University City Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 1992</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1992</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 1992</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Alignments/Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 1992</td>
<td>Community Bus Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1992</td>
<td>La Jolla Community Planning Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1992</td>
<td>La Paz Condo Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1992</td>
<td>North City Chamber of Commerce Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Community Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 1992</td>
<td>La Jolla Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16, 1992</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10, 1992</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment and Caltrans MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Environmental Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 1993</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 1993</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1993</td>
<td>Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Schedule &amp; Budget Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1993</td>
<td>North City Transit Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1993</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Planning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 1993</td>
<td>North City Transit Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1993</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Commuter Rail Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 1993</td>
<td>North City Transit Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 1993</td>
<td>Renaissance Homeowners Mtg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29, 1993</td>
<td>Renaissance Homeowners Mtg. - Capri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3, 1993</td>
<td>UCSD Campus Community Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4, 1993</td>
<td>North City Transit Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5, 1993</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Recreation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 1993</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 1993</td>
<td>Renaissance Homeowners Mtg. - Casa Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18, 1993</td>
<td>Renaissance Homeowners Mtg. - La Florentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 1993</td>
<td>North City Transit Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 1993</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 1993</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board Meeting - Commuter Rail Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 1993</td>
<td>MTD Board - Contract Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1994</td>
<td>MTD Board - Status and Deep Tunnel (Deferred to March 10, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1994</td>
<td>Rose Canyon Recreation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 1994</td>
<td>MTD Board Meeting - Status Report &amp; Deep Tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 1994</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1994</td>
<td>La Jolla Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 1994</td>
<td>Jewish Community Center at Eastgate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 1994</td>
<td>Renaissance Homeowners Meeting - Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1994</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16, 1994</td>
<td>Community Meeting at Nobel Drive Station Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13, 1994</td>
<td>UCPG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 1995</td>
<td>Public Meeting - DEIS - Clairemont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 1995</td>
<td>Public Meeting - DEIS - North University City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 1995</td>
<td>Public Hearing - DEIS - MTDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*May, 1995</td>
<td>Public Meeting - LPA - Clairemont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*May, 1995</td>
<td>Public Meeting - LPA - North University City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*June, 1995</td>
<td>MTD Board - LPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tentatively Scheduled

**D.2 AGENCY COORDINATION**

**D.2.1 Scoping**

The details and results of the scoping process for this project are summarized in a separate report available for review at the MTDB Offices. A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Transit Improvements in the City of San Diego, appeared in the Federal Register, Vol. 55, No. 70, April 11, 1990. Two EIR Notices of Preparation (NOP) were prepared and distributed on October 25, 1990 and revised on March 25, 1991. Agency responding in writing to the NOPs are listed below. Written responses are displayed in Appendix A.
• City of San Diego, City Administration;
• City of San Diego, City Operations
• City of San Diego, Engineering Division;
• City of San Diego, Executive Office
• City of San Diego, Fire Department;
• City of Santee;
• County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use;
• Federal Highway Administration;
• North County Transit District;
• San Diego County Archaeological Society;
• San Diego County, Bicycle Coalition;
• State of California, Office of Planning and Research;
• State of California, Public Utilities Commission;
• State of California, Department of Fish and Game;
• State of California, Department of Parks;
• State of California, Department of Transportation;
• United States Department of Agriculture;
• United States Department of the Navy;
• University of California, San Diego;

D.2.2 Coordination During Study Process

Extensive agency coordination and consultation has continued throughout the study process, with the following functions:

• Data collection/identification of resources;
• Compliance with regulatory requirements; and
• Review of and input to analysis results.
The following summarizes agencies consulted and the topic of discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>Alternative Definition, environmental review/coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Alternative Definition, environmental review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Miramar</td>
<td>Coordination with APZ, alignment issues, environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Floodplain definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>Farmlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Coast Guard</td>
<td>Bridge Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Interior, Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Postal Service</td>
<td>Land acquisition near La Jolla Village Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Environmental issues, air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Maritime Fisheries</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
<td>Air quality compliance/coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>Grade crossing design issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Environmental Coordination, HOV design, Section 4(f), project lead, freeway operations, air quality modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California, Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California, Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Section 4(f) process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California, Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>Water Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>Historic and Archaeologic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego, Planning Department</td>
<td>Land Use, Neighborhoods, Significance Determinations, Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego, City Council Staff</td>
<td>Study issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego, Parks Department</td>
<td>City Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego, Public Works Department</td>
<td>Municipal Utilities, Right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego, Traffic Engineering Department</td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego, Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Air quality compliance/coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego, Parks Department</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Commuter rail coordination, bus transit system coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>Modeling coordination, long range plan coordination, financing and programming, previous planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Gas and Electric</td>
<td>Electromagnetic radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego, California</td>
<td>Coordination with UCSD planning, alignment planning technical issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 28, 1994

Robert R. Robenhymer  
Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Attn: Dennis Wahl or Tony Mendoza

Re: I-5 Corridor Mid-Coast Project in San Diego County

Dear Mr. Robenhymer:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your letter dated May 19, 1994, requesting concurrence on the following four issues; 1) project purpose and need; 2) project alternatives to be evaluated; 3) identification of wetlands; and 4) conceptual mitigation plan. The Service appreciates the continued early coordination and planning effort the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) has made with the Service.

The proposed project is designed to improve mass transit service in the Mid-Coast Corridor which extends from the junction of Interstate 5 and Interstate 8, north along Interstate 5 to the vicinity of Del Mar Heights Road. The Service concurs with the project purpose and need. The proposed alternatives to be carried forward seem appropriate. It appears that the I-5 Westside Light Rail Transit (LRT) alternative impacts fewer resources than the Genessee Avenue LRT alternative, therefore the Service would recommend pursuing the former over the later.

Wetland delineation is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction, therefore the Service has no objection to reviewing the project with the information available, which includes an identification of wetlands, if the Corps has no objection. The conceptual mitigation plan accurately outlines the Service’s policy on wetland mitigation. The final plan should include detailed maintenance and monitoring guidelines as well as criteria for determining success of the site. Reports should be sent on a yearly basis to the regulatory agencies documenting the status of the mitigation site.

If you have any further questions concerning this letter, please call Susan Wynn of my staff at (619) 431-9440.

Sincerely,

Gail C. Kobetich
Field Supervisor
Robert R. Robenhymer  
San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Dear Mr. Robenhymer:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board’s (MTDB) draft Biological Resources Report and Water Resources Technical Report for the Mid-Coast Corridor. We concur that the project process should proceed to the next stage, namely circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), provided the DEIS contains additional information regarding wetland mitigation.

The conceptual mitigation plan outlined on page 81 of the Biological Resources Report is too general and does not identify candidate mitigation sites. MTDB should follow the NEPA/404 Mitigation Guidance (p. 21-28) to develop a feasibility study and conceptual mitigation plan for the DEIS. The intent of the concurrence process is to encourage agencies to consider impacts and develop mutually agreeable mitigation measures/plans while preparing the NEPA document.

We apologize for the lateness of our concurrence. EPA tried, unsuccessfully, for several weeks to reach your consultant to discuss the mitigation plan. If you have any questions regarding wetland mitigation, please contact Ms. Harriet Hill in EPA Region 9’s Wetlands and Sediment Management Section at (415) 744-1969.

Sincerely,

David J. Farrel, Chief  
Environmental Review Section  
Office of Federal Activities

002215

cc: Federal Transit Administration, San Francisco (B. Hom)  
Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento (M. Littlefield)  
Federal Highway Administration, San Francisco  
Caltrans, District 11, San Diego (T. Vasquez)
Mr. Robert R. Robenhymer  
Principal Planner  
Metropolitan Transportation Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, Ca 92101-7490  

Re: I-5 Corridor Mid-Coast Project, Additional Wetland Mitigation Information, January 4, 1994  

Dear Mr. Robenhymer:

We have reviewed the information referred to above, and also on January 10, 1994 Harriet Hill of our Wetlands and Sediment Management Section discussed it with Dennis Wahl of your staff, and Howie Wier of Dudek and Associates. We are pleased that the plan was recently revised to allow for a 3:1 rather than a 2:1 replacement ratio for riparian losses. We believe the new information generally satisfies the requirements of the 1994 NEPA/404/Surface Transportation Projects MOU related to mitigation, and thus the concerns stated in our August 31, 1994 letter have been resolved. Because future flood control measures could affect the feasibility of restoring wetlands at the Tijuana site, we believe the Lakeside site may be more likely to be implementable. However, as Ms. Hill stated to Mr. Wahl, more data on the Lakeside site's geology and hydrology must be provided at the Final EIS stage if the chosen preferred alternative requires wetlands mitigation. In this case, the Final EIS should document that the proposed on-site grading would not adversely affect downstream areas, and that the on-site hydrology could adequately support the mitigation wetland. If both the Lakeside and Tijuana sites prove infeasible, a feasible wetlands mitigation project must be discussed in detail in the Final EIS.

Thank you for providing this additional information for our review.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rosenbloom, Chief  
Wetlands and Sediment Management Section

cc: Corps of Engineers, San Diego  
Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad

Printed on Recycled Paper

1-23-95
Mr. Robert Robenhymer  
Principal Planner  
Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB)  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Robenhymer,

The Corps has reviewed MTDB's "Biological Resources Report" and "Water Resources Technical Report" for the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit Corridor (U.S. Department of Transportation, January 1994) in regards to compliance with the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding for Clean Water Act Section 404 permits. The Corps has also discussed the project with MTDB staff members Dennis Wahl and Tony Mendoza. The Corps concurs that the project process should proceed to the next stage, i.e., circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), provided the DEIS contains the additional information regarding wetland mitigation requested by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

As David Zoutendyk informed Tony Mendoza on April 8, 1994, the Corps agreed to review the project at this stage without a formal delineation of wetlands. A formal delineation would be required prior to issuing a permit for the project to be implemented. Also, as specified in the August 31, 1994 letter from EPA, more detailed information for wetland mitigation sites must be added to the document before it is circulated. The information to be provided, as listed in the letter of September 13, 1994 letter from MTDB to EPA, would be adequate.

If you have any questions, please call David Zoutendyk of my staff at (619)455-9414.

Sincerely,

John A. Gill  
Chief, Regulatory Branch
Mr. Robert Robenhymer  
Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Attn: Dennis Wahl

RE: I-5 Corridor Mid-Coast Project, San Diego County

January 11, 1995

Dear Mr. Robenhymer:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) received a request from the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), dated December 20, 1994, for concurrence that all listed or proposed species and designated or proposed critical habitat that may be present in the project area have been addressed prior to the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report.

The proposed project is designed to improve mass transit service in the Mid-Coast Corridor which extends from the junction of Interstate 5 and Interstate 8, north along Interstate 5 to the vicinity of Del Mar Heights Road. Enclosed with MTDB’s request was a copy of the Final Biological Resources Report dated January 17, 1994, and a list of sensitive biological resources that may occur in the project area.

The Service concurs with MTDB, that all sensitive species and critical habitat that may occur within the project area have been identified. We have enclosed an updated species list which only includes those species whose status has changed since the issuance of the Final Biological Resources Report. This list should be used as a basis for assembling a team of biologists with specific knowledge and ability to identify the species delineated on the list.

The Service feels that current comprehensive surveys of the proposed project area need to be completed. The last surveys of the area were completed in July of 1991 and since that time a number of species have been Federally listed or formally proposed as threatened or endangered species. Until the Service has received the survey results, we will not be able to assist the Federal Highways Administration or MTDB in determining the least damaging alternatives or assist in developing appropriate mitigation to offset any losses. We can work with you on a habitat basis immediately, if you have good habitat data and we can assume that the appropriate habitat is occupied. If listed species may be impacted by the proposed project consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act will be necessary. The Service recommends that the Federal Highways Administration conference with our agency on all proposed threatened or endangered species.
The Service thanks you for the opportunity comment on this project and appreciates the early coordination and planning effort the MTDB has made with the Service. Please send all future documents, survey and study results, meeting notices, and pertinent data concerning this project to our attention. If you should have any questions pertaining to these comments, please contact Shawnetta Grandberry or John Bradley at (619)-431-9440.

Sincerely,

Gail C. Kobetich
Field Supervisor

#1-6-95-SP-079

cc: CDFG, San Diego, CA (Attn: Bill Tippets and Tim Dillingham)
Federal Highways Administration
Supplemental List of Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, and Candidate Species that May Occur in the Area of the Proposed Interstate 5 Corridor Mid Coast Project, San Diego County, California (1-6-95-SP-079)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIRDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coastal California gnatcatcher</td>
<td><em>Polioptila californica californica</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAMMALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific pocket mouse</td>
<td><em>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego button celery</td>
<td><em>Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Orcutt grass</td>
<td><em>Orcuttia californica</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas Baccharis (San Diego coyote bush)</td>
<td><em>Baccharis vanessae</em></td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt's spineflower</td>
<td><em>Chorizanthe orcuttiana</em></td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-leaved Dudleya</td>
<td><em>Dudleya blochmaniae ssp. brevifolia</em></td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIRDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coastal cactus wren</td>
<td><em>Campylorhynchus bruneicapillus couesi</em></td>
<td>C3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy beach tiger beetle</td>
<td><em>Cincidela hirticollis gravida</em></td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego thornmint</td>
<td><em>Acanthomintha ilicifolia</em></td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley Chorizanthe</td>
<td><em>Chorizanthe parryi var. fernandina</em></td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Name | Scientific Name | Status
---|---|---
San Diego sunflower | *Hulsea californica* | C3c

E: Endangered
T: Threatened
PE: Proposed Endangered
PT: Proposed Threatened
C1: Category "1" candidate for listing; taxa for which the Service has substantial information to support listing as threatened or endangered.

C2: Category "2" candidate for listing; taxa that may warrant listing but for which substantial information to support a proposed rule is lacking.

C3: Taxa that are not currently being considered for listing as threatened or endangered:

(3a): taxa for which the Service has persuasive evidence of extinction. However, any such taxon is certain to get high priority for listing if rediscovered.

(3b): taxa that currently do not meet the Act’s definition of "species". Any such taxon could be reevaluated in the future as a result of subsequent research.

(3c): taxa that apparently more common than previously thought and thus not under current consideration for listing as threatened or endangered.

R: Recommended. Although not officially a candidate at the present time, species bearing this designation likely will be included in the recommended category in the next Notice of Review. Please note that some of these recommended candidates, like many of the category 1 and category 2 candidates listed above, are currently undergoing status review or are the subject of draft proposed rules.
January 10, 1995

Metropolitan Transit Development Board  
Attention: Dennis Wahl  
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000  
San Diego, California  92101-7490  

Re:  I-5 Corridor Mid-Coast Project  

Dear Mr. Wahl:  

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. It includes a number of alternative public transportation improvement packages for increased bus service, HOV lanes on I-5 and ramp metering at numerous I-5 on-ramps. In addition, some of the potential alternatives involve commuter rail service and the northern extension of the San Diego Trolley system as options.  

A brief review of the submitted "Mid Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis" resulted in several observations and/or concerns. Relatively small portions of the various proposed improvements occur within the coastal zone, primarily those components occurring along I-5 between I-8 and Balboa Avenue, some park and ride improvements within Mission Bay Park, the new commuter rail station in Sorrento Valley, and relocation of the existing park-and-ride facility in Carmel Valley. In addition, the creation of HOV lanes within the I-5 alignment may require approval from the Coastal Commission, or the City of San Diego under its certified Local Coastal Program, since highway projects that result in an increased number of lanes are not exempt from coastal development permit requirements, even if the improvements occur within the existing right-of-way.  

Typical issues addressed in coastal development permits include biological or wetland impacts, visual impacts, potential impacts on public access to the shoreline and public recreational sites, traffic impacts, appropriate land uses and the growth-inducing potential of infrastructure improvements. It appears that all these concerns have been identified and addressed in the subject document. It is possible that the Commission, and/or City may not agree with the conclusions of your document in all respects, but it will be difficult to determine if any outstanding issues remain until formal permit application is made. However, with respect to wetland impacts, the Coastal
Commission has historically sought mitigation at the ratios of 4:1 (area of mitigation to area of impact) for marsh impacts (salt or fresh) and 3:1 for riparian impacts. Your document identifies that mitigation would be at a minimum ratio of 1:1, but it is very likely that a significantly higher ratio will be required when you process your coastal development permit(s).

These comments reflect only a cursory review of the submitted document. It is possible that additional concerns may be raised when permits are processed; however, this should give a fair indication of the range of issues likely to be of concern to the Coastal Commission, or the City of San Diego should it be the permitting authority. If portions of your project are in both the City's and the Commission's permit jurisdictions, permits must be obtained from both entities. Please call me if you have further questions or if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Ellen Lirley
Coastal Planner

(4851L)
APPENDIX E

AA/DEIS/DEIR
LIST OF AGENCY RECIPIENTS

The following list of agency recipients is grouped into federal, state and local categories. Each category is further subdivided as to whether the agency will receive the Mid-Coast AA/DEIS/DEIR document, or receive a notice of availability. Those agencies receiving a notice of availability may request a copy of the document from MTDB at 1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000, San Diego, CA 92101-7490.

Federal - Agencies to receive copy of document

Mr. Fred Pierson
Community Planning Liaison Office
NAS Miramar, Code 00M
San Diego, CA  92145-5000

Mr. Doug La Maire
U.S. Navy
SW Division Naval Fac. Eng. Command
1220 Pacific Highway
Code 09PY
San Diego, CA  92132-5190

Ms. Brooks Harper
Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of Interior
24000 Avila Road
Laguna Niguel, CA  92656

The Honorable Randy Cunningham
Congressman - 51st District
U.S. House of Representatives
613 W. Valley Parkway, Suite 320
Escondido, CA  92025

The Honorable Duncan Hunter
Congressman - 52nd District
U.S. House of Representatives
366 South Pierce St.
El Cajon, CA  92020

The Honorable Barbara Boxer
U.S. Senate
Senator
525 B Street, Suite 990
San Diego, CA  92101

The Honorable Diane Feinstein
U.S. Senate
Senator
750 B Street, Suite 1030
San Diego, CA  92101

Mr. David Zoutendyk
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
9808 Scranton Road, #430
San Diego, CA  92121

The Honorable Brian Bilbray
Congressman - 49th District
U.S. House of Representatives
1011 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 330
San Diego, CA  92108

Ms. Harriet Hill
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA  94105-3901

The Honorable Ron Packard
Congressman - 48th District
U.S. House of Representatives
221 E. Vista Way #205
Vista, CA  92084 - 6009

Mr. Jonathan P. Deason
Director, Off. of Environmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Interior Building - MS 2340
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C.  20240
The Honorable Bob Filner  
Congressman - 50th District  
U.S. House of Representatives  
333 F Street, Suite A  
Chula Vista, CA  91910-2624

Mr. Gail C. Kobetich  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
2370 Liker Ave. West  
Carlsbad, CA  92008

Federal - Agencies to receive Notice of Availability

Mr. Sal Simonetti  
Deputy Director of Facilities  
MCRD  
Facilities Division, Bldg 224  
San Diego, CA  92140

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Resources Conservation Service  
215 Hickory Street, #126  
Escondido, CA  92925-4360

U.S. Department of Energy  
Director, Office of Environmental Compliance  
1000 Independence Ave, SW  
Room 46-064  
Washington, DC  92585

U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development  
Environment Clearance Officer  
P.O. Box 36003, 450 Golden Gate Ave  
San Francisco, CA  94102

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Spec. Assistant to Secretary  
Pacific Southwest Region  
P.O. Box 36098  
San Francisco, CA  94102

U.S. Federal Emergency Mgmt Agency  
Regional Director  
Region 9, Building 105  
Presidio, CA  94129

Mr. Tom Trujillo  
Administrator  
VA Medical Center  
3350 La Jolla Village Drive  
La Jolla, CA  92161

Lt. J.G. Gary L. Jones  
Marine Safety Office  
U.S. Coast Guard  
2710 North Harbor Drive  
San Diego, CA  92101

U.S. Federal Railroad Administration  
Office of Policy and Plans  
400 7th Street, SW  
Washington, DC  20590

District Engineer  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 2711  
Los Angeles, CA  90053-2325

Mr. David J. Farrel  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Wetlands Program Permitting Section  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA  94105
State - Agencies to receive copy of document

State of California
San Diego Region
Reg. Water Quality Control Board
9771 Clairemont Mesa Blvd, Suite B
San Diego, CA 92124-1331

The Honorable Dede Alpert
Assembly Member, 78th District
1350 Front Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Joey Bigomia
State of California
Public Utilities Commission
107 South Broadway, Room 5109
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Mr. Milton Phegley
University of California San Diego
Mail Code S-024
La Jolla, CA 92093

Mr. Larry Cruse
University of California San Diego
Library 0175R
La Jolla, CA 92093-0175

The Honorable Lucy Killea
Senator - 39th District
State of California
2550 Fifth Avenue, Suite 152
San Diego, CA 92103

Mr. Jim Conant
Director of Mass Transportation
State of California, CALTRANS
1120 N. Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

State of California Lands Commission
EIR Review Section
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Susan Davis
Assembly Member, 76th District
1080 University Avenue, Ste H201
San Diego, CA 92103

State of California
State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning & Research
1400 10th Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

Director
State of California
Coastal Commission
45 Freemont Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94105

Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Director - Campus Planning Office
University of California San Diego
Mail Code - Q-006
La Jolla, CA 92093

Director
State of California
Department of Fish & Game
1416 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Division of Transportation Planning
Caltrans
1120 N. Street
P.O. Box 1499
Sacramento, CA 95807

Mr. Fred Worthley, Regional Manager
State of California, Dept. of Fish & Game
330 Golden Shore Drive, Suite 50
Long Beach, CA 90802

Safety and Enforcement Branch
Rail Transit Safety Section
State of California
Public Utilities Comm.
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ms. Deborah Lee  
State of California  
Coastal Commission  
3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92108

Mr. Hans Kreutzberg  
Office of Historic Preservation  
State of California  
Parks & Recreation Department  
P. O. Box 92896  
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Division of Aeronautics  
Caltrans  
P.O. Box 942873  
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001

---

**State - Agencies to receive Notice of Availability**

Ms. Karen Hunter  
Caltrans Division of Rail  
1801 30th Street  
P.O. Box 942874  
Sacramento, CA 94724-0001

Mr. Robert Umstead  
University of California San Diego  
Mail Code Q-046  
La Jolla, CA 92093

Division of Water Quality  
State of California  
Water Resources Control Board  
P.O. Box 944213  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2130

External Affairs Commissioner  
University of California San Diego,  
Associated Students  
Student Center B-023  
La Jolla, CA 92037

State of California  
Public Utilities Commission  
1350 Front Street  
San Diego, CA 92101

Director, Dept. of Housing & Development  
State of California  
P.O. Box 952051  
Sacramento, CA 94252-2051

Ms. Molley McKay  
Vice President - External Affairs  
University of California San Diego,  
Associated Students  
UCSD - Code Q-077  
La Jolla, CA 92093

Mr. Richard C. Atkinson  
Chancellor  
University of California San Diego  
Mail Code Q-005  
La Jolla, CA 92093

State of California Resources Agency  
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

State of California  
Department of Conservation  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

State of California  
Department of Water Resources  
Southern District  
P.O. Box 6598  
Los Angeles, CA 90055

State of California  
Torrey Pines State Preserve  
Department of Parks & Recreation  
2680 Carlsbad Blvd  
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Local - Agencies to receive copy of document

Mr. David Di Pierro
City of San Diego Liaison
City of San Diego
c/o MTDB

The Honorable Susan Golding
Mayor
City of San Diego
202 C Street - MS 11A
San Diego, CA 92101

Ms. Nancy Acevado
City of San Diego
Department of Parks and Recreation
M S 35

Ms. Sue Blackman
Council District 6
City of San Diego
202 C Street - MS 10A
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Mike Westlake
City of San Diego
Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue - MS 4A
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Langley Powell
President
San Diego Trolley
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. George Frank
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Torrey Pines Community Planning Group
13713 Recuerdo Drive
Del Mar, CA 92014

Mr. Ron Yagura
Acting President
San Diego Transit Corp.
100 16th Street
San Diego, CA 92101

The Honorable Scott Harvey
Council Member - Council District 2
City of San Diego
202 C Street - MS 10A
San Diego, CA 92101

Mr. Ron Yagura
Acting President
San Diego Transit Corp.
100 16th Street
San Diego, CA 92101

The Honorable Scott Harvey
Council Member - Council District 2
City of San Diego
202 C Street - MS 10A
San Diego, CA 92101

Ms. Ann Hix
Developmental & Environmental Planning
City of San DiegoDevelopment Services
1222 First Avenue, Floor 5 (MS 501)
San Diego, CA 92101

Ms. Sue Blackman
Council District 6
City of San Diego
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SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION
PACIFIC HIGHWAY OVERPASS HOV DROP–RAMP

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act (Public Law 89–670–80 Statutes 931), the Secretary of Transportation shall not approve any project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State or local significance as determined by the Federal, State or local officials having jurisdiction thereof, or any land from an historic site of national, State or local significance as so determined by such officials unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from such use.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

The Metropolitan Transportation Development Board (MTDB) and the California Department of Transportation are co–lead agencies for the Mid–Coast Alternatives Analysis, which is evaluating transportation improvements in the I–5 corridor. It is being conducted in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Mid–Coast Corridor has been defined as an area extending from near the junction of I–5 and I–8, north along I–5 to the vicinity of Del Mar Heights Road. The Study Area is shown in Figure 1.
The proposed work is intended to help relieve existing and expected traffic congestion on I–5. See Chapter 1 in the Mid–Coast Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR) for a detailed description of the project's Purpose and Need.

The high occupancy vehicle (HOV) Lane Alternative would provide HOV lanes on I–5 from just north of Carmel Mountain Road to just south of the Pacific Highway overcrossing of the San Diego River. They would be buffer separated with limited access every 3.2 to 4.8 km (2–3 miles) for buses and vehicles with two or more occupants. Other alternatives being considered in the Mid–Coast Alternatives Analysis include No Build, Transportation System Management (TSM), TSM Commuter Rail, TSM Commuter Rail Tunnel, and light rail transit. Detailed descriptions of these alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 of the AA/DEIS/DEIR and in the Final Definition of Alternatives Report, October 1994.

A Drop–Ramp, i.e., a ramp from the middle of an overpass into the median of a freeway, is proposed to be constructed from the Pacific Highway overcrossing to the new HOV lanes in the median of I–5 as part of the HOV Lane Alternative. The drop–ramp would have one lane in each direction to provide a direct connection for HOVs between the Pacific Highway overpass and the I–5 median HOV lanes proposed in the HOV Lane Alternative. It would provide direct access to Mission Bay Park, Sea World Drive, and the Old Town Transit Center for HOVs. The drop–ramp would allow vehicles with two or more persons and buses to by–pass the Tecolote Road interchange in favor of the drop–ramp, avoiding the delay associated with Tecolote Road's signalized intersections and thus saving travel time.

The drop–ramp would require reconstruction of the Pacific Highway overcrossing. The overcrossing would be relocated south of the existing location in order for the drop–ramp grade to meet design standards as it joins the freeway level just south of the Tecolote Road overcrossing. Figure 2 illustrates the location and concept of the proposed drop–ramp.
Since the Pacific Highway overcrossing will be reconstructed, the western approach and embankment will also need to be reconstructed. The reconstruction of the west approach directly impacts Mission Bay Park and would require an exchange of parcels within the park.
Proposed Pacific Highway
Drop-Ramps Location and Concept
DESCRIPTION OF SECTION 4(f) PROPERTY

Regional Location

The property affected by the proposed drop-ramp is located within Mission Bay Park, a dedicated City of San Diego park located north of I-8 and the San Diego River, and immediately west of I-5 (see Figure 3).

Property Description

Mission Bay Park is owned by the City of San Diego and covers over seven square miles (4,600 acres). It was established through dredging and filling operations in the late 1940s to convert a marsh into an intensively used aquatic park. In 1944, a San Diego Chamber of Commerce committee recommended developing Mission Bay into a tourist attraction, as part of an overall effort to diversify the City's largely military economy. In 1945, approximately 2,900 acres of land within the Park was granted to the City by a State Tidelands Grant.

It is comprised of 2,100 acres of land and 2,500 acres of water. The park contains numerous water, picnicking and vacation resort amenities and represents one of the most important recreational and tourist facilities in the City of San Diego. The park accommodates over 100,000 people on a peak summer day. A Local Coastal Plan addendum, adopted in January 1982, specifies the land and water uses within the park. Approximately 745 dwelling units in the form of trailer homes exist within the Plan area (the trailer court has a long term lease with the City), along with the Sea World aquatic park and hotel facilities.

Mission Bay Park is bounded by major roadway facilities on all sides and includes numerous vehicular and pedestrian access points. From the west, the interior of the park can be reached via Mission Boulevard and West Mission Bay Drive. Primary access to the park from the south is provided by Midway Drive and Sunset Cliffs Boulevard. Visitors from the north can access Vacation Isle, an island in the middle of Mission Bay, via Ingraham Street.
Access to the swimming and picnicking areas in the eastern portion of the park, near the area affected by the proposed drop ramp, is provided principally by East Mission Bay Drive, which may be reached directly from I–5 via the Pacific Coast Highway overpass as well as the Tecolote Road and Clarmont Drive interchanges. Mission Bay Park is popular with bicyclists and bicycle access to the eastern portion of the park is provided along East Mission Bay Drive from the north and south, as well as Sea World Drive, Pacific Coast Highway/Fiesta Island Road, Tecolote Drive and Clairemont Drive.

**Property Affected**

The proposed drop-ramp and associated overcrossing reconstruction would affect a small portion of an undeveloped area located in the southeastern corner of Mission Bay Park. The area north of Fiesta Island Road (the west approach to the Pacific Highway bridge) is used occasionally for parking or storage. The area south of Fiesta Island Road is essentially unused. Mission Bay Park, including the portion of the property affected by the proposed drop-ramp, is shown in Figure 4.

**Planned Improvements to the Property**

A Master Plan for Mission Bay Park has recently been approved by the San Diego City Council. The Plan includes numerous improvements, including several in the vicinity of the proposed drop-ramp. Figure 5 (from the draft Mission Bay Park Master Plan) illustrates these improvements.

As shown in Figure 5, the currently undeveloped area east of I–5 to the immediate north and south of the Pacific Highway overcrossing and the proposed drop-ramp is planned for overflow parking. The area north of the overpass is planned to accommodate 600 parking spaces and will be surfaced with compacted gravel. The area south of the overpass will accommodate 2,200 spaces and will be paved. Movement between the north and south parking lots is planned to be provided by an underpass of Pacific Highway. There are also plans to set aside nine acres between the 2,200 parking spaces and I–5 for park operations and maintenance.
Mission Bay Park
& Proposed HOV Drop Ramp Project
Figure 5

Planned Park Improvements

MID-COAST CORRIDOR
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS/DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT STUDY

Metropolitan Transit Development Board
San Diego, California

Source: Mission Bay Park, Draft Master Plan; 1993
Relationship to Other Similarly Used Lands in the Vicinity

Aside from San Diego Bay, there are no nearby functionally equivalent aquatic parks in the area that offer the range of water recreation opportunities of Mission Bay Park. Other water recreation in the vicinity include the City-owned ocean beaches of Mission Beach, Pacific Beach and La Jolla. Open space areas include Rose Canyon to the northeast, Tecolote Canyon to the east and the San Diego River flood channel to the south. These areas are shown on Figure 6.

IMPACTS ON THE SECTION 4(f) PROPERTY FROM THE HOV LANE ALTERNATIVE

Reconstruction of the west approach to the Pacific Highway overcrossing and proposed drop ramps would require an exchange of parcels within Mission Bay Park. Impacts of the proposed drop-ramp are summarized below.

Property Impacts (Takings and Vacations)

The proposed drop-ramp and reconstruction of the Pacific Highway overcrossing will require relocation of the existing overcrossing approximately 200 feet south as shown in Figures 7, 8 and 9. The relocation will require the taking of 0.7 acre of Mission Bay Park property located in a strip along the southern edge of the existing overcrossing and along the western edge of Caltrans I-5 right-of-way. The relocation will vacate 1.0 acre of park land currently covered by the overpass. The proposed drop-ramp will result in a net return of 0.3 acre to the park.

Reconstruction of the overpass and implementation of the proposed drop ramp for the Mid-Coast HOV Lane Alternative would not preclude any of the planned improvements contained in the Mission Bay Park Draft Master Plan and would not compromise the function of the planned parking lots or underpass. The underpass is included in the Mission Bay Park plan and was considered in its environmental review. It would accommodate both pedestrians and automobiles.
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Traffic Impacts

Traffic impacts associated with the proposed drop-ramp and overpass reconstruction have been identified by comparing future traffic conditions with (Build Alternative) and without (No Build Alternative) the proposed project. In accordance with FHWA requirements, the traffic analysis of the project assumes the horizon year 2010. Only the Build Alternative assumes implementation of the I-5 median HOV lanes described in the Mid-Coast HOV Lane Alternative.

A detailed analysis of the traffic impacts of the proposed Pacific Highway Drop-Ramp is included in the February 9, 1994 Technical Memorandum, *Description of and Justification for the Drop-Ramp to Pacific Highway for HOV Alternative*. The following is a summary of the analysis methodology and conclusions.

The fundamental effect of the proposed drop-ramps will be to reroute multiple occupant vehicle traffic from the intersections of Pacific Highway/Sea World Drive, Sea World Drive/I-5 northbound ramp, and Sea World Drive/I-5 southbound ramp, to the proposed drop ramps. The proposed drop-ramps would provide direct connections between southbound I-5 traffic destined for the Pacific Highway and northbound Pacific Highway traffic destined for the I-5 HOV lanes. In the absence of the drop-ramps, traffic making these connections would use the Sea World Drive/I-5 ramps to/from I-5 and pass through the Sea World Drive/Pacific Highway intersection to/from Pacific Highway.

In addition to travel time savings to I-5 HOV traffic and reduced weaving conditions on I-5, the proposed drop-ramps will improve access to Mission Bay Park by reducing traffic at the intersections of Sea World Drive with the I-5 ramps and Pacific Highway. Table 1 shows intersection volume-to-capacity ratios and levels of service (LOS) with and without the proposed drop-ramps.
TABLE 1
HOV ALTERNATIVE PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION ANALYSIS RESULTS
WITH AND WITHOUT PACIFIC HIGHWAY DROP–RAMP (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>HOV w/o Drop–Ramp</th>
<th>HOV w/ Drop–Ramp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>PM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I–SSB/Sea World</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I–5NB/Sea World</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea World/ Pacific</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Noise and Visual Impacts

The proposed drop–ramp would shift traffic away from the park (from Sea World Drive onto the drop–ramps) and would not result in adverse noise impacts.

The proposed drop–ramps will represent a new visual element in the vicinity of the affected park land. A visual impact assessment was prepared for the drop ramps and it found the primary impacts to be from the travel lanes, retaining walls and concrete supports of the drop ramp structure, and the removal of Oleanders in the center median of I–5. Also, the view of a portion of Mission Bay Park would be obstructed by the structure. The views of both highway users and residents in the area would be affected. However, the portion of Mission Bay Park that would be blocked is an undeveloped parcel used for parking and storage and is not considered significant. The impact of the drop structure would be reduced through enhanced design of the walls (color and texture) and concrete supports associated with the ramp, as well as a decrease in scale when possible. Removal of the Oleanders would be mitigated by new plantings in the freeway right–of–way. The area blocked from view of the northbound motorists is currently used for storage and overflow parking. It is not used for recreational purposes and is of low visual quality.
AVOIDANCE ALTERNATIVES

No Build Alternative

The highway element of the No Build alternative does not include HOV lanes in the median of I-5. If the HOV project is not constructed, the existing Pacific Highway overcrossing would be retained and there would be no impact on the Park. The benefits of decreased congestion on I-5 would not be realized.

The southeastern corner of Mission Bay Park is planned for development as a parking area and maintenance facility as part of the Mission Bay Plan. These improvements will go forward regardless of the proposed HOV project. The amount of parkland would not be increased through the property swap.

Alternative Designs

Within the HOV Lane Alternative, two alternatives to the proposed drop-ramps which would avoid park lands impacts were evaluated but were rejected for safety and operational reasons.

1. Use the Existing Pacific Highway overcrossing with no relocation to the south (Figure 10)

2. Relocate the overcrossing and drop ramp to the north, closer to Tecolote Road

Utilization of the existing overcrossing was considered and not pursued for the following reasons:

- The existing structure has a pavement width of 28 feet (two 12-foot lanes and two 2-foot shoulders) with 3-foot sidewalks. The drop ramp would require left turn lanes for vehicles turning onto the drop ramp and standard shoulders. It would also need to accommodate bike lanes to match the roadways approaching the existing structure.
The existing structure has a 6 percent cross-slope that would require the drop ramp to have a large vertical curve to tie into the bridge deck, while still providing adequate stopping sight distance approaching the intersection. The 6 percent cross-slope would result in vehicles turning onto a 950-foot horizontal curve on the existing bridge from the drop ramp at about a 45 degree skew, a significant reverse superelevation. This would be a difficult maneuver for a bus.

The existing structure was not designed to accommodate a large drop ramp attached to it.

Widening the existing structure would result in reduced vertical clearance over I-5 to the south, and increased height of the drop ramp to the north to match the existing 6 percent cross-slope.

To design the drop ramp with vertical curves that provide adequate sight distance and with a grade no greater than 6 percent (recommended for buses), the drop ramp would not be at-grade when crossing underneath the Sea World Drive overcrossing, and would not have adequate vertical clearance under the structure.

Use of the existing overcrossing would entail significant widening of the western approach, which would impact park property.

Relocation of the overcrossing to the north, closer to the Tecolote Road interchange, was considered and not pursued for the following reasons:

Constructing a new Pacific Highway overcrossing north of the existing structure would make it difficult to connect the city street back into the existing Sea World Drive/Fiesta Island Road intersection without taking additional parkland, and reducing the design speed by adding horizontal S-curves. On the west side, the only access road to a storage business would be impacted or completely blocked off by the new structure.
Having the drop ramp tie into a new structure north of the existing structure would not meet vertical clearance requirements as it passes underneath the Sea World Drive overcrossing.

Vehicles exiting the HOV lane as they approach the drop ramp would be required to merge into the I-5 main lanes close to the end of the southbound I-5 on ramp from Sea World Drive. Vehicles from the on ramp and the HOV lanes would be merging into the freeway main lanes at the same location which could result in operational and safety problems.

The Mid-Coast AA/DEIS/DEIR also includes four other build alternatives and the No Build Alternative that could be selected for implementation in the corridor. None of these other alternatives would have direct impacts on Mission Bay Park lands.

MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM

The preliminary design of the proposed Pacific Highway Drop–Ramps minimizes impacts to Mission Bay Park property to the maximum extent possible while maintaining the functionality of the proposed drop ramp. The design features the following elements to minimize harm to park property:

- The west approach to the overcrossing would be built on an embankment with architecturally treated retaining walls to limit encroachment into the park. The impact of the retaining wall can be reduced through enhanced design of the walls (color and texture) and a decrease in scale when possible. The less expensive option of a sloped, earthen embankment without retaining walls, would impact more park land.

- The west abutment of the overcrossing has been pushed west far enough to allow the planned two lane circulation road connecting the north and south sides of the parking lots described in the Park Master Plan.
COORDINATION WITH APPROPRIATE AGENCIES

The proposed Pacific Highway Drop–Ramps have been the subject of meetings and correspondence between the Mid–Coast Corridor AA/DEIR/DEIS co–lead agencies, MTDB and Caltrans, and the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department, the agency having jurisdiction for the affected park property.

Letters summarizing the understanding between MTDB, Caltrans and the Park and Recreation Department are included in the Appendix. As stated in the May 3, 1994 letter from Marcia McLatchy, the City of San Diego Parks and Recreation Director, the City has accepted the proposed drop–ramps with the condition that the design allow the planned parking lot access road underpass of Pacific Highway.

OTHER PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES EVALUATED FOR PROXIMITY IMPACTS

The following facilities were evaluated for proximity impacts:

- Tecolote Canyon Natural Park
- Marian Bear Memorial Park
- Rose Canyon Park Preserve
- Torrey Pines State Reserve
- Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve
- Seven Historical and Archaeological Sites
- Bicycle Facility between Balboa Avenue and Gilman Drive

The HOV Lane Alternative does not require land from any of the above listed park, recreational facility, wildlife/waterfowl refuge, or historical resources. They are evaluated in the following discussions for potential proximity impacts resulting from the HOV Lane alternative.
Tecolote Canyon Natural Park

Tecolote Canyon Natural Park is a dedicated City of San Diego park. It consists of 903 acres and is located east of I–5, with its southern access approximately 0.4 miles from the Tecolote Road interchange with I–5. It includes a recreation center and golf course as well as a large undeveloped area of canyon land. Access is provided from Tecolte Road, Mount Acadia Boulevard, Snead Avenue, Balboa Avenue and Genesee Avenue.

No land will be required from the park for the HOV Lane project. The improvements would not be visible to the park due to the distance from I–5, the presence of buildings between the park and the freeway, and the topography of the canyon itself. There would be no noise impacts due to the distance of the canyon from the freeway. There would be no air quality impacts to the park. The predicted 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations in the vicinity would be below Federal and State Standards. There would be no impact on accessibility to the park.

Marian Bear Memorial Park

Marian Bear Memorial Park is a City of San Diego parkland, located south of SR–52 and along I–5 north of SR–52. It consists of 467 acres and access is provided from Regents Road and Genesee Avenue. It is a natural park with hiking trails, parking, picnic areas and restroom facilities.

No land would be required from the park for the HOV Lane project. The improvements would not be visible from the park due to its lower elevation and distance from I–5. There would be no noise impacts due to the distance from I–5 and the park’s lower elevation. There would be no air quality impacts to the park. The predicted 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations in the vicinity would be below Federal and State Standards. There would be no impact to the accessibility to the park.

Rose Canyon Park Preserve

The Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve is dedicated City of San Diego parkland. It is 278 acres and consists of a naturally vegetated valley floor bordered on the south by steep slopes. The
existing railroad right-of-way forms the northern border of the preserve. Access is provided from Regents Road, Genesee Avenue, La Jolla Colony Drive and a bike path on the preserve’s western side.

No land would be required from the preserve for the HOV Lane project. The improvements would not be visible from the preserve due to its lower elevation and distance from I–5. There would be no noise impacts due to the distance from I–5 and the preserve’s lower elevation. There would be no air quality impacts to the preserve. The predicted 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations in the vicinity would be below Federal and State Standards. There would be no impact to the accessibility to the preserve.

Torrey Pines State Reserve

Torrey Pines State Reserve is located west of I–5 in the vicinity of Sorrento Valley. It is approximately 1,100 acres and consists of a visitor area, hiking trails and picnic areas, beaches, golf course, as well as naturally vegetated areas. Access is provided from North Torrey Pines Road.

No land would be required from the reserve for the HOV Lane project. Some of the improvements, primarily the direct HOV lane connectors between I–5 and I–805, would be visible from parts of the reserve. This impact cannot be fully mitigated. There would be no noise impacts due to the distance from I–5 and the lower elevation of nearby portions of the reserve. There would be no air quality impacts to the reserve. The predicted 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations in the vicinity would be below Federal and State Standards. There would be no impact to the accessibility to the preserve.

Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve

The Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve includes 2,500 acres of publicly-owned land between I–5 and I–15. The Preserve is a resource based park with recreational and educational use by the public as a secondary objective. It forms a continuous open space corridor between I–5 and I–15.
Access to the Preserve is provided by Black Mountain Road, Sorrento Valley Boulevard, and Park Village Road.

No land would be required from the preserve for the HOV Lane project. Some of the improvements, primarily the direct HOV lane connectors between I-5 and I-805, would be visible from parts of the preserve. This impact cannot be fully mitigated. There would be no noise impacts due to the distance from I-5 and the lower elevation of nearby portions of the preserve. There would be no air quality impacts to the preserve. The predicted 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations in the vicinity would be below Federal and State Standards. There would be no impact to the accessibility to the preserve.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it can be concluded that the HOV Lane Alternative would not cause a constructive use of these park resources because the proximity impacts would not substantially impair the utility of the parks.

Historical and Archeological Sites

Seven historical and archeological sites have been identified in the vicinity of the HOV Lane Alternative. None of the sites are on the National Register of Historic Places. None of them are directly impacted by the HOV Lane Alternative. Each is discussed below.

Site MC-1/H-1. This site is the location of a small structure located along the railroad tracks near Morena Boulevard north of Tecolote Creek. It is a disturbed shell and lithic scatter with a few pieces of historic glass observed on the surface. It was identified on a 1928 aerial photograph of the region. The site has been bisected by the railroad tracks and the construction of Morena Boulevard.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I-5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site.
Site H-4. One structure and several small structures were located on the east side of the railroad line on the 1901 USGS map. The site was the location of the Ladrillo station for the Santa Fe Railroad line and the Rose Canyon brick works. The train station was created to assist the brick works. The surface manifestations have been modified by recent development and railroad activity. There is potential for buried cultural remains.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I-5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site.

Site CA-SDI-12,558. The site consists of a small scatter of shell located at the northern terminus of Santa Fe Street. The shell scatter is superficial and the shell may have been imported to the area as part of the grading for Santa Fe Street or I-5. No artifacts were discovered.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I-5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site.

Site CA-SDI-12,557. This site is located along Rose Creek along the east side of the I-5 right-of-way at the Gilman Drive interchange. The site was subjected to a 100% surface collection that recovered 1,740 artifacts. Testing also revealed a subsurface deposit at this site.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I-5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site since it is located in the Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve.

Site CA-SDI-12,560H. This site is located along Rose Creek and overlaps the northern area of prehistoric site CA-SDI-12,557. It represents the location of the Gustavus Fischer ranch, founded in 1853. A house and a barn are shown in the area on the California Southern Railroad Survey map of 1880. Later photos show a dairy at the site. The surface evidence of this site is minimal, due in part to the Hatfield Flood which destroyed the dairy in 1916. There is evidence of a
subsurface deposit, covered by alluvial soil. Testing resulted in the discovery of a stone foundation and trash pit, and the recovery of 7,681 artifacts.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I–5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site since it is located in the Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve.

Site CA–SDI–12,559. This site is described as a prehistoric artifact scatter and deposit located in the same general area along the west side of Rose Creek as CA–SDI–11,783H. The site has been tested and 191 artifacts were found. The site has been extensively disturbed by the construction of the railroad line 1881 and by the later construction and demolition of the Elvira Station.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I–5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site since it is located in the Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve.

Site CA–SDI–11,783H. This historic site represents the old Elvira railroad siding and associated structures. The station operated from 1905 to 1930, and the site consists of the foundation and basement of a small home, a garage and a bunkhouse for the railroad crews. Remains of a prehistoric site have also been found. The site was disturbed by construction activity during the 1950s. The canyon was to be made into a city park and bulldozers cleared the land and demolished the structures before the project was abandoned. The remaining cultural resources on the site were affected by the demolition process.

The site would not be affected by the construction of the HOV Lane Alternative since all of the activity would take place in the median of the existing I–5 freeway. There would be no construction staging activity at this site since it is located in the Rose Canyon Open Space Preserve.
Bicycle Facility Between Balboa Avenue and Gilman Drive

This bicycle facility runs along Santa Fe Street to its northern end where it turns into an exclusive bike path that runs north to Gilman Drive. Construction of the Balboa and Gilman Park-and-Ride lots would affect the path. At Balboa Avenue, the ramp from eastbound Balboa Avenue to northbound Morena Boulevard would be closed. A pathway for bicycles would be provided within the station. At Gilman Drive, the bike path runs through the site of the park-and-ride lot. It would be relocated within the lot.

City of San Diego staff was consulted to determine if the bike path is considered a recreational or transportation facility. They consider it to be a transportation facility due to its heavy commuter use. In fact, the City would require that provisions are made to ensure that the facility remains open or substitute service is provided if there are any closures of the path during construction activities. As a result, the provisions of Section 4(f) are not triggered.
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Attachments
May 3, 1994

Mr. Robert R. Robenhymer
Principal Planner
Metropolitan Transit Development Board
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

Subject: I-5 CORRIDOR MID-COAST PROJECT

Dear Mr. Robenhymer:

This letter is in response to your letter of February 9, 1994, requesting our review and comment for the proposed I-5 transportation improvements in the Mid-Coast corridor. We have received the documents, Parklands Technical Report and the revised Pacific Highway Overcrossing, you provided and forward the following comments:

Revised Pacific Highway Realignment

The realignment of Pacific Highway as shown in the correspondence dated April 6, 1994, is acceptable to us. However, since the draft Mission Bay Park Master Plan proposes an underpass at Pacific Highway (see attached), we believe that this feature should be part of the proposed realignment for the I-5 Corridor Mid-Coast Project.

Parklands Technical Report

General

There are a number of errors in the delineation of city owned Dedicated and Non-dedicated open space. If corrections are to be incorporated into this document, a meeting to discuss the maps would be beneficial. Please contact Nancy Acevedo, Deputy Director, Park Development & Open Space Division at 525-8223.
This report addresses acquisition of a portion of the Mandell Weiss-Eastgate City Park. This acquisition will affect design and construction of the final portion of the park by the Jewish Community Center of San Diego, which has a lease on the property until 2031. The loss of over 7,000 square feet of park land, approximately 20 on-site parking stalls and the inability of the Jewish Community Center to construct City required facilities is expected to be an unacceptable impact.

We identified no other significant impacts and thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Marcia McLatchy
Parks & Recreation Director

KH/kh/midcoas.ltr

Attachment

cc: Deputy Director, Coastline Parks & Golf
Deputy Director, Park Development & Open Space
Deputy Director, Property Management
Mission Bay Park Manager
March 4, 1991

Mr. Marc K. Soronson
Sr. Transportation Planner
ICF Kaiser Engineer's, Inc.
4625 South Wendler Drive, Suite 204
Tempe, AZ  85282

Subject: Mid Coast Transit Corridor (AA/DEIS/DEIR)

Dear Mr. Soronson:

This is in reference to your letter dated February 6, 1991 regarding the Mid Coast Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

This division has reviewed the alignments proposed in the sketch attached to your letter as they may relate to impact on existing and proposed parkland. Enclosed is a map showing all of the existing park facilities in the alignment area. At this time, there are no additional parks planned in this area through the year 2005.

Please call Vince Marchetti at (619) 525-8239 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

R.J. Ferrier
Deputy Director

VJM:sv:PDQT3511

cc:  V. Marchetti
     S. Pye
July 13, 1990

Mr. Marc K. Soronson  
Sr. Transportation Planner  
ICF Kaiser Engineer's, Inc.  
4625 South Wendler Dr., Su. 204  
Tempe, Arizona, 95282

Subject: Mid Coast Transit Corridor (AA/DEIS)

Dear Mr. Soronson:

This is in reference to your letter dated June 27, 1990 regarding the Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Mid Coast transit corridor.

The proposed alternatives as indicated on your map may impact either or both park areas and open space space areas. In order to determine which areas may be affected, I am requesting that you contact the Deputy Director of the Open Space Division and the Deputy Director of the Park Development Division of this department for the information required. The addresses and phone numbers are as follows:

Nancy Acevedo  
Deputy Director Open Space Division  
3770 Highland Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92105  
Phone (619) 236-7038

Robert J. Ferrier  
Deputy Director Park Development Division  
Balboa Park Club  
Balboa Park, M.S. 35  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Phone (619) 236-6686

It would also be extremely helpful if you could provide them with larger maps showing in greater detail the proposed alternative alignments.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

GEORGE I. LOVELAND  
Park and Recreation Director

VJM:sv:PDLT2995

cc: Acevedo  
Ferrier
APPENDIX I

Caltrans Project Study Report
(Provided Under Separate Cover)