MID-COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT
San Diego, California

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(Final EIS)

Volume II

by the

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)

and the

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD

PREPARED PURSUANT TO:
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, §102 (42 U.S.C. §4332); Federal Transit Laws
(49 U.S.C. §5301(e), §5323(b) and §5324(b)); Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice);
Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 CFR 771; National Historic Preservation Act

June 2001
PREFACE

This is the second volume of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) for the proposed Mid-Coast LRT Project, Balboa Extension and Nobel Drive Coaster Station. Pursuant to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the EIS analyzes potential impacts of transit improvements proposed by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), at the project-specific level.

The Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report (AA/DEIS/DEIR) was circulated for public and agency comments in February of 1995. The AA/DEIS/DEIR provided an analysis of a broader range of proposed investment alternatives and resulted in the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative/Preferred Investment Strategy (LPA). A public hearing on the AA/DEIS/DEIR was held on April 27, 1995. In October 1995, the MTDB certified the Final EIR, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and approved a LPA. A full description of the LPA is provided in Section 2.1.1 of this FEIS, and in a separate report, LPA Report (December 1995). The Mid-Coast LRT Project, Balboa Extension and Nobel Drive Coaster Station represents the extent of new LRT rail alignment and stations and new Coaster stations, and related facilities that MTDB projects it can construct and operate given its financial plan.

The first volume of this Final EIS contains information regarding the purpose and need for the project, alternatives considered, and the environmental and socioeconomic effects that can be expected if the project is implemented. Where necessary, text revisions have been made to reflect the change in the Build Alternative from the alternatives considered in the AA/DEIS/DEIR, and in response to comments on the AA/DEIS/DEIR. Information reported in the AA/DEIS/DEIR is summarized, and additional clarification is provided regarding potential impacts of the Mid-Coast LRT Project, Balboa Extension and Nobel Drive Coaster Station, and a low cost Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative. Potential impacts of the No-Build Alternative are also described.

This second volume contains copies of all written and oral comments received on the AA/DEIS/DEIR, along with written responses to those comments. Previous responses to the comments pertaining to the AA/DEIS/DEIR were prepared prior to the selection of the LPA and circulated with the Final EIR. While some responses provided in this FEIS are identical to those provided in the FEIR, it was necessary to revise a number of responses to reflect the selection of the LPA and the further refinement of the Mid-Coast LRT Project, Balboa Extension and Nobel Drive Coaster Station.

Several of the comments and responses address issues associated with the extension of the LRT to the University City area (the "University City Extension"). The University City Extension is not part of the proposed project now being considered by the Federal Transit Administration in this FEIS. Due to the low potential for funding to be available for design and construction of the University City Extension in the near future, the MTD Board determined that it would not be appropriate to conduct preliminary engineering and prepare a final environmental impact statement for it at this
time. When funding does become available for the University City Extension, additional environmental analysis will be performed.

A listing of all agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the AA/DEIS/DEIR is provided. Comments were numbered for the FEIR, and that numbering system has been maintained to allow comparisons between the documents.
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December 1, 1993

Mr. Jim Herl, ASLA
Mr. Martin Schmidt, ASLA
KTUL/A
6165 Greenwich Drive, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92122

Dear Messrs. Herl and Schmidt:

Subject: BAY PARK COMMUNITY PETITION AND ASHTON STREET TROLLEY STATION REPORT

Thank you for forwarding the Bay Park Community Petition for our review. If the petition is circulated, we would ask that you include an explanation that MTD is considering not only a trolley line in the I-5 corridor, but also other alternatives to improve transportation, as well. These alternatives are Transportation Systems Management (TSM), which includes improved bus service and new park-and-ride lots; TSM Plus Commuter Rail Stations, including one at Balboa Avenue; High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on I-5; and Light Rail Transit (i.e., LRT or trolley). These alternatives are explained in the attached fact sheet. Also attached is a response to your July 12, 1993 letter.

You may want to reconsider the petition after you read the attached memo regarding a station near Ashton Street. The memo documents our observations of the area and the potential for an LRT stop at Ashton Street. We found that the Ashton Street site has comparable surrounding population and employment to other stations in the vicinity. An Ashton Street Station does not, however, have better access to Mission Bay Park or areas east of the Ashton Street community because of the roadway network and existing bridges near the other two station sites. The addition of a bridge at Ashton Street would provide superior pedestrian access; however, there would be higher costs and greater impacts to views than the planned situation. Based on this analysis, we would not recommend pursuing the Ashton Street site. The focus of our efforts will be to improve the pedestrian access of both the Clairemont Drive and Tecolote Road bridges.

The schedule for the Mid-Coast Alternatives Analysis calls for distribution of the document in February 1994 for public review, with Board adoption of a locally preferred alternative in June 1994. During the review period,
comments regarding the stations in the Bay Park area would be welcome. If you would like to discuss this matter further, please call me at 557-4539.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Wahl
Senior Transportation Planner

Attachments: Fact Sheet
Response to July 12, 1993 letter
Ashton Street Trolley Station Memo
MID-COAST CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

MTDB, in conjunction with the Federal Transit Administration, the California Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration, is evaluating alternatives for improving mass transit services in the Mid-Coast Corridor. The Mid-Coast Corridor extends from the junction of Interstate 8 and Interstate 8, north along Interstate 8 to the vicinity of Old Miramar Road.

PROJECT PURPOSE

The Mid-Coast Corridor was formally identified as a regional transportation improvement project in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan of 1986. Since then, San Diego County voters have approved the development of light rail transit (LRT) within the Mid-Coast Corridor in 1987 as part of the Transportation Sales Tax Program. MTDB's objective is to provide transportation improvements to the Mid-Coast Corridor in order to increase accessibility and opportunities for both residents of, and travelers to, the Corridor.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The federal government requires MTDB to consider transportation alternatives to LRT to ensure that the alternatives are adequate to serve the proposed service.

The alternatives under study include:

- **No Build:** No new transit facilities, no new transit services, and no new transit-related improvements. This alternative includes: elimination of all existing transportation investments and improvements within the area.

- **PSM (Transportation Systems Management):** This alternative includes all projects for the No Build Alternative, plus increased bus service, light and rapid rail service, and new mass transit facilities. Projects include:
  - Additional express bus services
  - New rail service facilities
  - New rail service facilities
  - New rail service facilities
  - New rail service facilities

- **BTS (Bus and Rail System):** This alternative includes all projects for the No Build Alternative, plus increased bus service, increased rail service, and new rail service facilities. Projects include:
  - Increased bus service
  - Increased rail service
  - Increased rail service
  - Increased rail service

- **BTS+ (Bus and Rail System Plus):** This alternative includes all projects for the No Build Alternative, plus increased bus service, increased rail service, and new rail service facilities. Projects include:
  - Increased bus service
  - Increased rail service
  - Increased rail service
  - Increased rail service

- **HOV/Lanes**
  - HOV/Lanes includes all projects from the BTS Alternative plus High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on I-15 from the Carmel Mountain Road overpass to the vicinity of I-8. Some service would be required to use the HOV lanes. The HOV lanes would be separated from adjacent traffic lanes by painted lines, with access limited at every two to three miles at major interchange points.

- **LRT**
  - The LRT Alternative would extend LRT (operated by San Diego Trolley) up to 10.4 miles from Old Town to a station at Techno Centre Drive/Executive Drive. The alignment would be through the existing VCTD-owned right-of-way

  - Alignment Options:
    - Alignment Option, which extends north to a station at Techno Centre Drive/Executive Drive, and terminates at a station at Techno Centre Drive/Executive Drive.
    - Alignment Option, which terminates at a station at Techno Centre Drive/Executive Drive, and terminates at a station at Techno Centre Drive/Executive Drive.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

The Board is scheduled to select a feasibility study alternative by mid-1994. If selection and implementation proceed in a timely manner, the LRT project would be completed by 2005.

FINANCIAL PROGRAM

Funding for the Mid-Coast Project will be provided in a variety of federal, state, and local funds. Capital cost range from as low as $21 million (1992 $) to the BTS Alternative up to $350 million (1992 $) for the BTS Alternative.

November 1993

1255 Impala Avenue, Suite 1000, San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 232-1466

MTDB is an equal opportunity provider.
RESPONSE TO JULY 12, 1993 HERL AND SCHMIDT LETTER
REGARDING ASHTON STREET TROLLEY STATION

CIRCULATION

The lack of congestion here (at Ashton Street) would lessen the traffic impact on either off-ramp.

The traffic analysis conducted for the Mid-Coast Project has found that there will be no increase in congestion to the major streets surrounding the Tecolote Road or Clairemont Drive Trolley Stations. The addition of these trolley stations decreases forecasted traffic volumes on Interstate 5.

Access to both the neighborhood and to the I-5 and I-8 freeways is more direct from Ashton Street.

Access to the neighborhood surrounding Ashton Street would be more direct with the Trolley station located there. Access to Ashton Street from I-5 or I-8 is no more direct than to the Tecolote Road or Clairemont Drive stations.

There is an existing bus stop at Ashton Street.

An Ashton Street station would be accessible to one bus route under existing and future conditions. The Clairemont Drive Station will have two, possibly three bus routes serving it; Tecolote will possibly have one.

It is a practical distance between the proposed Old Town and Balboa Avenue stations.

Ashton Street is well located between the proposed Old Town and Balboa stations. However, if only one station is constructed (Tecolote Drive, Ashton Street, or Clairemont Drive), it would most likely be at Clairemont Drive due to its superior accessibility, higher surrounding population and employment, greater number of planned bus connections, and the existing link to Mission Bay Park.

ECONOMICS

A single station could be constructed instead of two.

As mentioned above, if only one station is constructed, it would most likely be at Clairemont Drive.
The commercial district at Ashton Street would benefit from riders and park users. The Ashton Street Station would serve the commercial district in the surrounding area, as well as the San Diego Hilton on Mission Bay. The employment surrounding Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive Stations is greater and therefore, those stations would serve more employment.

Caltrans has a responsibility to safely connect the neighborhood with the park and should bear the costs of the pedestrian bridge.

We are unaware of any obligation Caltrans has to constructing a pedestrian connection to Mission Bay Park at Ashton Street. Access to the park is available now, with the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive bridges.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Trolley riders and residents could directly access the park without having to cross dangerous freeway on-ramps (with 10-inch-high curbs and no ramps).

A bridge at Ashton Street would make it safer for pedestrians to access the park. Improvements such as curb cuts and signalized intersections would improve pedestrian use of the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive bridges.

Disabled access to the park could be proactively provided.

Currently, there is no disabled access to the park from the Clairemont area. An Ashton Street bridge would create this access. As mentioned earlier, improvements could also be made to the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive bridges.

The pedestrian bridge could originate alongside the trolley stop and end at the existing open expanse of lawn on the opposite side of I-5 across from a guarded beach and tot lot.

The Ashton Street bridge landing in Mission Bay Park has amenities similar to the existing Clairemont Drive bridge landing. An Ashton Street bridge would give employees and customers of the Hilton, access to the trolley system.
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Memorandum

Date: December 1, 1993
To: Dennis Wahl
From: Tony Mendez
Subject: MID-COAST STATION AT ASHTON STREET

This report analyzes the potential for a station site at Ashton Street as proposed by Jim Heri and Martin Schmidt, residents of the Ashton Street area and landscape architects (see attached letters). The site was compared to the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive station sites based on population, employment, trip-end information, field evaluations, and physical conditions. A map indicating station locations and one-third-mile radius around each station is attached. Three charts comparing the sites are also attached. Based on this analysis, an Ashton Street station would perhaps be a better community station than the Tecolote Road station because of higher surrounding population and superior community access. Ashton Street, however, is less accessible than the other two stations due to the surrounding roadway network, physical hindrances surrounding the Ashton Street community (canyons and hills isolate the community), and existing bridges at the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive stations that serve Mission Bay Park. The addition of a pedestrian bridge at Ashton Street would improve pedestrian access to the park, but would have higher costs and impacts to views.

STATION SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Tecolote Road

Development surrounding the Tecolote Road site consists primarily of commercial and industrial uses. Office, showroom, and industrial buildings dominate the immediate area. South of the Tecolote Road-Bridge there is a nursery, various restaurants, and small hotels. A concrete flood channel to the north runs parallel to the bridge. There is a mix of low- and high-density residential units on the hill east of the commercial area. A few single-family homes, medium-density apartments, and mobile homes are located at the east end of the bridge near the Tecolote Road and Morena Boulevard intersection. Residents in this area cannot access the Tecolote Road bridge directly behind their homes because the streets end in cul-de-sacs bordered by fences and a steep hillside. This forces them to walk out of direction to Morena Boulevard then west on Tecolote Road to access the bridge.

VOLUME II COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
VOL II-166
Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11

Mid-Coast Corridor Project, Final Environmental Impact Statement

Pedestrian and vehicular access to Mission Bay from the Tecolote Road station is provided by the Tecolote Road bridge. The sidewalk on the south side of the bridge is temporarily closed due to Caltrans construction. The curbs are 10 inches high and there are no curb cuts, therefore, there is no bike lane. There are traffic signals at each on- and off-ramp in this diamond interchange for east-west pedestrian movements. Heading west on the north side of the bridge leads to the Fiesta Island area, but pedestrians must walk approximately 300 feet out of direction to the south in order to reach an attractive area of the park.

Pedestrian access to the bridge from the Tecolote Road station is included in the station design. Vertical circulation is included in the site plan; however, elevators are not and, therefore, disabled access would be forced one mile out of direction to access the bridge from the station.

Bus service is provided in the area by San Diego Transit Routes 5 and 105, but is not planned to directly serve the station. It is proposed in the Mid-Coast LRT Alternative that Route 105 terminate from the north near Jutland Drive. Route 5 could be rerouted down West Morena Boulevard with no out-of-direction travel. This option is not included the Mid-Coast LRT Alternative.

Ashton Street

Ashton Street is 3,500 feet south of Clairemont Drive and 3,000 feet north of Tecolote Road (see attached figure). The community near Ashton Street, east of Morena Boulevard, consists primarily of single-family homes with a few multi-family residences on the western fringe of the community. Small retail businesses and restaurants are located near Morena Boulevard. An Early Learning Center is located at Ashton Street and Chicago Street; a neighborhood market is across the street. Area residents currently have a link to Mission Bay Park via Clairemont Drive or Tecolote Road. Few sidewalks line the streets in this area. Commercial land uses north of Hilton Street limit pedestrian access from the north; the south is blocked off by Tecolote Canyon; to the east is a hillside developed with homes.

The Ashton Street Station site is currently served by San Diego Transit Routes 5 and 105. The Mid-Coast LRT Alternative proposes that Route 105 terminate from the north near Jutland Drive; Route 5 would continue to serve the area.

Clairemont Drive

The Clairemont Drive Station site is surrounded by high-density residential units and diverse commercial uses. The street pattern forces autos to make circuitous routes to access the site due to one-way and discontinuous streets. Pedestrians can access the site from all directions due to open parking lots that allow pedestrians to walk through and that pedestrians can travel either direction on one-way streets.

The Clairemont Drive bridge connects to Mission Bay Park at the San Diego Visitor Information Center. The bridge serves as an on- and off-ramp for Interstate 5 and provides access from Clairemont Drive to the park. The southbound on- and off-ramps are in a half-clover-leaf configuration. The
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Northbound on- and off-ramps are in a "T" configuration. Caltrans uses yield signs to control traffic on the clover-leaf ramps, while traffic signals are present at "T" intersections. This presents a situation where pedestrians are forced to cross one unsignalized, high-speed on-ramp on the north side of the bridge to access the park; on the south side of the bridge, pedestrians are forced to cross three unsignalized high-speed, off-ramps and one low-speed on-ramp. The north side of the bridge is temporarily closed to pedestrians due to Caltrans construction.

Sidewalks on the Clairemont Drive bridge are of standard five-foot width. There is no sidewalk extension to the park and no bicycle lane. No disabled access exists due to lack of curb cuts. The curbs are approximately 10 inches high, compared to typical curb heights between six and eight inches. There is a staircase leading from the station site to the south sidewalk of the bridge; however, unless an elevator is installed from the station site directly to the bridge, disabled persons would be forced to travel approximately 400 feet out of direction, to the east end of the bridge, to access the park.

The station site is currently not served by any bus routes. The Mid-Coast LRT Alternative plans for this site to be served by San Diego Transit Route 20 from the north and Route 25 from the east. A bus drop-off location would be located south of the LRT platform along Morena Boulevard. Route 5 could be rerouted (approximately 0.6 miles out of direction) by coming up Morena Boulevard to Jellet Street, over to Chicago Street, and back down Ingulf Street to turn into the station at Morena Boulevard. The rerouting of Route 5 has not been considered in the Mid-Coast LRT Alternative.

SITE COMPARISONS

The Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive stations are more desirable station sites because of the existing bridges, higher surrounding employment, greater opportunities for expansion, and better regional access. These charts are attached that support this conclusion. The first chart shows population, employment, trip-end information, and number of bus routes that serve the stations. This information was analyzed to develop the station comparison chart that rates various aspects of the station. The third chart describes the station site characteristics. The Ashton Street site would be a better community-serving station than the Tecolote Station, but it would not be as accessible to the region.

CONCLUSION

An Ashton Street Station would primarily serve the immediate surrounding community. If pedestrian access at Ashton Street to the park was provided, it would serve mostly the residents of Ashton Street and the customers and approximate 350 employees of the San Diego Hilton on Mission Bay. It would not, however, serve Mission Bay Park significantly better than the Tecolote Road or Clairemont Drive stations, as the existing bridges provide vehicular and pedestrian access to the park. The addition of a pedestrian bridge at Ashton Street is not necessary for the LRT project. It would be desirable to make improvements to the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive bridges to enhance pedestrian access to the park from the proposed stations. Ashton Street would not be more accessible to the region.
than Tecolote Road because of the existing bridge and higher surrounding employment at Tecolote Road.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Access from the Tecolote Drive and Clairemont Drive stations should be provided directly to the adjacent bridges to minimize out-of-direction travel and provide access for disabled persons. Vertical circulation is planned for both the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive stations without elevators.

- Improvements should be made to the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive bridges to make pedestrian use safer and more convenient. These include: curb cuts, signalized intersections (for Clairemont Drive only), and extensions of the sidewalks to Mission Bay Park. These improvements may be done to only one side of the bridge to minimize costs and need for multiple elevators.

- Route 5 should be considered for rerouting to serve both the Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive stations.

Attachments: July 12, 1993 and October 16, 1993
Letters from Jim Heri and Martin Schmidt
Map Showing One-Third-Mile Radius
Tecolote Road, Ashton Street, and Clairemont Drive
Stations - Population, Employment and Trip-Ends
Comparison of Tecolote Road, Ashton Street
and Clairemont Drive Stations
Station Site Comparisons

Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11
July 12, 1993

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

Dear Mr. Wahl:

We are writing as private citizens to introduce to you an idea which we believe will make a positive contribution to MTD's growing circulation network and to the quality of life in San Diego.

This idea involves the construction of a trolley/pedestrian bridge link to Mission Bay Park from Morena Boulevard, midway between the off ramps at Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive. To be quite honest, this idea is both professionally and personally motivated. We are landscape architects I with KTU+ A, one of your consulting firms; Mr. Schmidt is a landscape architect for the City of Chula Vista. We both served as members of the Aesthetics and Design subcommittee for the Mission Bay Park Master Plan. We are both residents of the Clairemont/Bay Park community.

Via KTU+ A I have learned of MTD's upcoming draft Mid-Coast Study which will include the tentative locations of trolley stops at both Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive. Public input on the Mission Bay Park Master Plan has exposed the need for safe pedestrian access to the park from the Clairemont/Bay Park side of I-5. The location of a single trolley stop with an associated pedestrian bridge, located on Morena Boulevard opposite the small commercial district on Ashion Street makes sense for the following reasons:

CIRCULATION
• The lack of congestion here would lessen the traffic impact on either of ramp.
• Access to both the neighborhood and to the I-5 and I-8 freeways more direct from this location.
• There is an existing bus stop here for transit interconnection.
• It is a practical distance between the proposed Old Town and Balboa stops.

ECONOMIES
• A single stop could be constructed instead of two.
• The commercial district at Ashion Street would benefit from riders and park users.
• Caltrans has a responsibility to safely connect the neighborhood with the park and should bear the costs of the pedestrian bridge.

PUBLIC SAFETY
• Trolley riders and residents could directly access the park without having to cross dangerous freeway onramps (with 10' high curbs and no ramps).
• Disabled access to the park could be positedly provided.
• The pedestrian bridge could originate alongside the trolley stop and end at the existing open, unobstructed view of the park across the opposite side of I-5 across a guarded beach and tid lot.

Enclosed are some annotated photographs which will help to explain what words cannot. If convenient to you, we would like to follow this letter with a phone call or if you like, you can reach Jim Nerl at KTU+ A (619-682-8328) or at home (275-3123).

Sincerely,

Jim Nerl, ASLA

Martin Schmidt, ASLA

Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11
Mid-Coast Corridor Project, Final Environmental Impact Statement

Note: Mr. Neil and I met with staff from MTDB regarding this proposal. Current planning by Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) has two stations proposed: One of the Clairemont Drive overcrossing and one at the Sea World Drive overcrossing. Based on current funding and phasing, the trolley is likely to run north from the Old Town Station to the proposed Baboo Avenue Station. This would be the terminus of the light rail system until sufficient funding is secured to extend the line to North County. General response from staff was supportive of this one station concept in regards to funding and bus line connection issues. However, additional planning and environmental studies would have to be conducted.

This proposal is a logical solution for identification and inclusion in the Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update for the following reasons:

1. The addition of this dedicated overcrossing provides an opportunity to identify the park and provide safe and convenient access to the park from the Clairemont/Bay Park neighborhood. A design competition could be organized for the design of the overcrossing as a gateway and entry feature to the park.

2. The cost of constructing the one overcrossing would be less than modifying the other two overcrossings. The dedicated overcrossing would also function better than the other two modified overcrossings due to the numerous vehicular/pedestrian interfaces that exist where the traffic transitions onto the freeway onramps. The cost for the dedicated bridge could be shared between Carlsbad, City of San Diego, and MTDB.

3. The location would connect the local business district and the proposed right rail and bus transit center to the park. The Mission Bay Park tram stop could be sited at the foot of the overcrossing and the services of the Hilton Hotel would realize additional exposure. This would provide regional public transit access to the park.

4. The existing business district provides the opportunity for transit oriented development to be expanded, and provide park users with the ability to solely access the market and specialty stores that cater to park users. Currently, people have to drive over the freeway and on Moreno Blvd to get to the businesses.

We urge the Mission Bay Planners to have the foresight to review, consider and include this proposal in the final document for the Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Martin F. Schmidt ASLA  
RLA 3010

cc: 
Mr. Dennis Wohl  
MTDB
Ms. Martha McLatchy  
Director of Parks and Recreation
Mr. Tim Allison  
Carlsbad

Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11

VOLUME II COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
VOL II-171
Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11
Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11
### TECOLOTE ROAD, ASHTON STREET AND CLAIREMONT DRIVE STATIONS: POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRIP-END INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>2010 Est Daily</th>
<th>Total # 100 MILE RADIUS</th>
<th>1 MILE RADIUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-COAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecolite</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0 462</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clairemont</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES:** 1990 Census Data, SANDAG Series 7 Regional Growth Forecast, SANDAG TSM/Commuter Rail Model Run with Hobel and Balboa Stations

---

**VOLUME II COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

**VOL II-174**

Attachment to Public Hearing Comment Numbers PH8 through PH11
### COMPARISON OF TECOLOTE ROAD, ASHTON STREET AND CLAIREMONT DRIVE LRT STATIONS

#### EXISTING CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TECOLOTE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHTON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIREMONT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FUTURE AND PLANNED CONDITIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TECOLOTE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHTON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIREMONT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 1 to 3: 1 = best conditions, 3 = needs most improvement  
* Assumes rerouting SD Transit Rt. 5 and construction of Ashton Street pedestrian bridge. Ashton St. information not available for future conditions, therefore, these factors are not considered for future comparisons.

---

VOLUME II COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

VOL II-175
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TECOLOTE ROAD</th>
<th>ASHTON STREET</th>
<th>CLAIREMONT DRIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In industrial area with high surrounding regional-serving employment. Few amenities nearby. Isolated area, not very visible from I-5.</td>
<td>Highly visible location. Good community amenities (market, child care). Difficult to walk to from areas north and south of the immediate surrounding neighborhood.</td>
<td>Highly visible from two major arterials. Good future bus service. Surrounded by high density condos and apartments. Good community amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Available in railroad ROW</th>
<th>Available in railroad ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Access</th>
<th>TECOLOTE ROAD</th>
<th>ASHTON STREET</th>
<th>CLAIREMONT DRIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible from W. Morena Blvd. 1-8, I-5. Access from Tecolote Rd./Sea World Dr. is circuitous. Good access to Point Loma, Ocean Beach and Fiesta Island.</td>
<td>Accessible from Milton St. and Morena Blvd. Good visibility from I-5.</td>
<td>Good access from I-5. Circuitous access from Clairemont Dr. Good access to Mission Bay Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Potential</th>
<th>TECOLOTE ROAD</th>
<th>ASHTON STREET</th>
<th>CLAIREMONT DRIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for future expansion.</td>
<td>Single-family homes may object to future expansion.</td>
<td>Good opportunities for incorporating TOD into redevelopment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>