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**ABSTRACT**

The proposed project is the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): 2006 Update, referred to as the proposed Plan. This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) addresses the environmental effects of the proposed Plan as an update of the Systems Development component of **MOBILITY 2030, The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region**. The proposed Plan revises or eliminates certain projects in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 in accordance with recent calculations of project costs and a new evaluation of revenue constraints. This SEIR, pursuant to Section 15163 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, has been prepared to address changes in the **Final Environmental Impact Report for MOBILITY 2030: The Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region** (State Clearinghouse No. 2002071059) (FEIR) that are necessary to make the FEIR adequately apply to the proposed Plan.

Based on an Environmental Initial Study prepared for the proposed Plan, SANDAG has determined that changes in the FEIR required to assess the proposed Plan would be needed only in the Project Description (Chapter 2.0) and Traffic/Circulation sections (Chapter 4.4) of the FEIR, and that only minor changes to those sections would be necessary to make the FEIR adequately apply to the proposed Plan. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15163 of CEQA, SANDAG determined that a Supplement to the FEIR (a Supplemental EIR), would be the appropriated environmental review document for the proposed Plan. This Supplemental EIR addresses the changes to the FEIR necessary to make the FEIR adequately apply to the proposed Plan. The Supplemental EIR concludes that no significant adverse impacts would occur based on the significance criteria in the FEIR, although revenue constraints and rising costs would reduce the traffic and transit efficiency of the proposed Plan compared to adopted MOBILITY 2030.
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1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): 2006 Update, referred to in this document as “the proposed Plan.” It is a proposed update of MOBILITY 2030, The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region, adopted by SANDAG in 2003 as the Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region. SANDAG is the Lead Agency for this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) and is responsible for deciding whether to approve the proposed Plan.

This SEIR documents the changes in the Final Environmental Impact Report for MOBILITY 2030: The Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region (FEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2002071059) that would be necessary to make the FEIR adequately apply to the proposed Plan. The proposed transportation network in the proposed Plan, compared to the FEIR, is the basis of evaluation in this study. Chapter 2.0 (Project Description) and Chapter 4.4 (Traffic/Circulation) are the sections of the FEIR where changes are required and are incorporated by reference.

This SEIR in its entirety consists of the following four sections, 1.0 through 4.0, and Attachment A. Attachment A is an environmental Initial Study which examines the proposed Plan and compares it to the adopted MOBILITY 2030 for all environmental issues covered by the FEIR. The Initial Study was used to determine that a Supplemental EIR is appropriate environmental document, according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for review of the proposed Plan. Section 1.0 describes the proposed Plan and its differences from MOBILITY 2030. Section 2.0 describes the environmental review conducted for MOBILITY 2030 and the reasons the proposed Plan has been developed. Section 3.0 briefly explains the reason a Supplemental EIR has been chosen by SANDAG as the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed Plan. Section 4.0 contains changes to the Traffic/Circulation section necessary to make the FEIR adequate for environmental review of the proposed Plan.

1.2 THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The current Plan, MOBILITY 2030, consists of four main components: (1) Land Use, (2) Systems Development, (3) Systems Management, and (4) Demand Management. Each component has a unique role in improving mobility and travel in the San Diego region through
the year 2030. The Systems Development component is composed of the transit, highway, and freeway improvement projects needed to implement MOBILITY 2030.

The proposed Plan consists of the Systems Development component only of MOBILITY 2030 as modified by revenue constraints and increased costs. The projects included in the proposed Plan are located in roughly the western third of San Diego County. The MOBILITY 2030 Systems Development component and the changes that would be effected by the proposed Plan are described in more detail in Sections 1.3 and 1.4 below. Figure 1-1 (at the end of this SEIR) shows the proposed Plan network.

1.3 TRANSIT PROJECTS

The regional transit network is shown in Figure 1-2 (at the end of this SEIR). The goal of the enhanced transit program is to provide an attractive alternative to the use of a single occupant automobile and to provide needed transportation to people who do not own or operate a car. Both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan include new transit routes that would operate at higher speeds in the year 2030. Spacing stations farther apart than current transit services achieves these higher transit speeds. New stations would be integrated into central activity areas that include pedestrian and bicycle-friendly components. The proposed transit services include the use of a new type of transit vehicle known as flex trolleys or “trains on tires.” This type of low-floor vehicle has the flexibility of buses while offering operational characteristics similar to rail systems. It also allows for the use of electronic fare cards to allow for easier and speedier boarding.

These features are common to both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan. Some improvement projects in MOBILITY 2030, however, have been eliminated or partially eliminated in the proposed Plan, as explained below.

Table 1-1 shows the differences in transit services between the proposed Plan and adopted MOBILITY 2030. Changes between the two scenarios are indicated by strikeout and shading. Strikeout indicates items in adopted MOBILITY 2030 that would change, have been completed, or would be eliminated; shading indicates changes proposed in the proposed Plan. For example, transit route 611 would be operated differently under the proposed Plan as compared to adopted MOBILITY 2030, so headway would increase by 5 minutes.
**Table 1-1**

Transit Services in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Peak Headway (minutes)**</th>
<th>Off-Peak Headway (minutes)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Increase in Coaster</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Increase in Sprinter Rail - North County Fair (Rail)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Temecula to Sorrento Mesa via Mira Mesa</td>
<td>15-20*</td>
<td>30-60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>NE Oceanside to UTC via El Camino Real/1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Increase in Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Increase in Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Increase in Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Mid-Coast LRT to Sorrento Mesa (Transitway)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Escondido to Centre City/SDIA via I-15/SR 94 (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard to Centre City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Old Town to Balboa via Mission Blvd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>32nd St to Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Coronado &amp; Centre City to Sorrento Mesa via Hillcrest/Genesee Avenue (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>H Street to SW College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Centre City to Otay Mesa via SR 94/I-805</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC Super Loop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>El Cajon to UTC via SR 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Sorrento Mesa via I-805/I-15 (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.

**Peak headways at 15 minutes to Escondido and 30 minutes to Temecula; off-peak headways at 30 minutes to Escondido and 60 minutes to Temecula.

Table 1-2 shows the changes in the transit capital improvement projects between the adopted MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan. Projects that have been completed, modified, or would be eliminated from the adopted plan in the proposed plan are shown in strikeout. Early Action/Transit First Now Projects have been reprioritized in the proposed Plan, but are not new projects.
**Table 1-2**

Transit Improvements in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Adjacent Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East Trolley Extension*</td>
<td>Mission Valley East Extension is an extension of the San Diego Trolley light rail system from its current terminus in Mission Valley at Mission San Diego 5.9 miles to Grossmont Center. Stations include an underground station at San Diego State University.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido Sprinter Rail Double-Tracking and North County Fair Extension</td>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido Sprinter Rail project is a 24-mile light rail line serving the SR 78 corridor, now under construction and planned to open in 2007. This service will be a single-track system with 15 stations including Oceanside and Escondido Transit Centers, Palomar College, and Cal State San Marcos. The proposed Plan calls for double-tracking that line, increased service frequencies, and an extension from the Escondido Transit Center to North County Fair.</td>
<td>Oceanside Vista San Marcos Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa Transitway</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa Transitway is a grade-separated transit-only facility in the Sorrento Mesa/University City area of San Diego.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa Transitway</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa Transitway is a grade-separated transit-only facility in the Sorrento Mesa/University City area of San Diego.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail is an extension of the San Diego Trolley from the Old Town Transit Center, along I-5 to University City and along the Sorrento Mesa Transitway.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Double-Tracking and Other Improvements</td>
<td>Coastal Rail double-tracking includes a number of double-tracking and related projects along the coastal rail line between Oceanside and downtown San Diego. These include siding projects, bridge replacements, safety improvements, and passenger enhancements planned to benefit services using the coastal rail corridor (i.e., Coaster, Amtrak, and freight). Double-tracking is also proposed along the Sprinter alignment.</td>
<td>Oceanside Carlsbad Encinitas Solana Beach Del Mar San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnels at University City and Del Mar</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnels at University City and Del Mar would provide better reliability, safety, and travel time savings to the rail services using the coastal rail corridor.</td>
<td>Del Mar San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Light Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>Other Regional Rail Grade Separations include a number of grade separations along the current Blue Line Trolley, between San Ysidro and downtown San Diego, and the Sprinter rail line. Exact locations are to be determined at a later date.</td>
<td>Chula Vista San Diego Oceanside Escondido Vista San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Action/Transit First Now Transit First Priority Measures Projects (These projects were in MOBILITY 2030 but are reprioritized in the proposed Plan.)</td>
<td>Transit improvements considered Early Action/Transit First Now would include transit priority measures (e.g., signal priority, queue jumpers), real-time/next-bus information at stations, next-generation vehicles, and other station and service improvements that could be implemented over the short term to enhance existing and future transit services.</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Adjacent Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers</td>
<td>All Jurisdictions except for Imperial Beach Del Mar Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers are either improvements to existing or the construction of new transit centers. These include design features like shelters, landscaping, and integration with the local community; advanced systems like real-time information; and pedestrian-friendly features. Additional parking is provided at a number of these stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Direct Access Ramps to Managed/HOV Lanes | San Diego Chula Vista National City Santee Encinitas Escondido |
| Direct access ramps to Managed/HOV lanes provide a direct connection for transit from the HOV or managed lanes on the freeway to the transit center. |

| Vehicles for New Regional and Corridor Transit Services | Systemwide |
| Rail vehicles for new regional transit services could include a variety of different vehicles such as light and commuter rail vehicles, articulated bus, standard bus, or flex trolleys. |

| Arterial BRT Transit Priority Improvements | Systemwide |
| These BRT improvements enable transit to bypass traffic-choked areas on major arterials. They can include signal priority, grade-separated intersections, or queue jumper lanes. Exact locations along a given route would be determined at a later date. |

*Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.*

1 Indicates project has been completed.

### 1.4 FREEWAY AND HIGHWAY NETWORK

The proposed Plan, like adopted MOBILITY 2030, includes operation and maintenance of the region’s highway and arterial network as an important component of the 2030 RTP. Major categories of the proposed improvements for highways and arterials include managed/HOV lane facilities, direct HOV to HOV connections, Highway System Completion, Highway and Arterial Widening, and new Freeway to Freeway Connections. The highway and regional arterial improvements proposed in the proposed Plan, together with other improvements adopted in 2003 and already constructed, are integrated and coordinated to support and complement the expanded transit system. This includes the managed/HOV lane facilities, some of which support the regional network of transit services. The highway network proposed by the proposed Plan is shown in Figure 1-3 (at the end of this SEIR).

In Table 1-3 below, the freeway and highway system capital improvement projects in the proposed Plan are compared to the matching projects in adopted MOBILITY 2030. The differences in the projects between the adopted and proposed plan are due principally to the difference in projected available revenue; that is, construction and right-of-way costs have
increased so dramatically that slightly fewer projects could be built under the Revenue Constrained option.

### Table 1-3
Freeway and Highway Projects in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOV and Managed Lane Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Centre City Pkwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 I-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 I-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54/ SR 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 SR 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 SR 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 I-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOV Connectors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>East to South &amp; North to West</td>
<td>East to South &amp; North to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>South to West &amp; East to North</td>
<td>South to West &amp; East to North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Highway System Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5/I-805</td>
<td>Port of Entry – Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Inspection Facility</td>
<td>Inspection Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Camino Ruiz</td>
<td>Carmel Country</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>Navajo Road</td>
<td>Grossmont</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>Jamacha Road</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highway Widening, Arterials, and Freeway Interchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I Street</td>
<td>Sea World Dr.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Access Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>10F</td>
<td>14F</td>
<td>14F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>J Street</td>
<td>Alcoa Cn</td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St.</td>
<td>Dye Rd.</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75/</td>
<td>Glorietta Blvd.</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd.</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C + 2TU</td>
<td>6C + 2TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 282**</td>
<td>Melrose Dr.</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>J Street</td>
<td>Alcoa Cn</td>
<td>2F</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Road</td>
<td>Steele Cyn. Rd.</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Telegraph Cyn.</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>8T</td>
<td>8T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regionally Significant Arterials and Local Access Freeway Interchanges **Retained**

### Freeway Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5/I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>East to North &amp; South to West</td>
<td><strong>Eliminated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>West to South &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to South &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- C = Conventional Highway Lanes
- ML = Managed Lanes (HOV & Value Pricing)
- ML(R) = Managed Lanes (Reversible)
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- T = Toll Road
- MB = Movable Barrier
- TU = Tunnel

* Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and 2006 Plan scenarios are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.
** Privately funded.
*** Funding from federal discretionary defense funding sources.

As shown in Table 2-3, under the proposed Plan, HOV and managed lanes on I-5 south of I-805 have been eliminated. In contrast, the addition of four managed lanes on I-5 would be on a longer stretch of I-5 under the proposed Plan, extending south from SR 56 to La Jolla Village Drive instead of from SR 56 to I-805 under adopted MOBILITY 2030.
2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On March 23, 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted MOBILITY 2030, The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region as the Regional Transportation Plan. The RTP is a comprehensive plan for major transportation projects in San Diego County through 2030. The plan adopted from among several alternatives was based on reasonably expected funding and implementation cost projections.

MOBILITY 2030 has four major components. These are:

- **Land Use** – a projected land use pattern
- **Systems Development** – a network to move people and goods, consisting primarily of highways, roadways, and transit services
- **Systems Management** – strategies to improve transportation system efficiency
- **Demand Management** – measures to reduce congestion during highest demand

Concurrent with the adoption of MOBILITY 2030, the SANDAG Board of Directors certified the FEIR for MOBILITY 2030. Accordingly, the FEIR serves as the environmental document for MOBILITY 2030.

The FEIR addressed impacts that would be associated with the transportation projects required for implementation of MOBILITY 2030 in the San Diego region. The FEIR determined that, after implementation of mitigation measures, development of projects in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 would have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with visual and biological resources.

The SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for MOBILITY 2030 on March 23, 2003. Having considered the unavoidable adverse impacts of MOBILITY 2030, the SANDAG Board of Directors determined that the project’s unavoidable impacts could not be further reduced and that all feasible mitigation had been provided to avoid or reduce the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR; that no additional feasible mitigation was available to further reduce significant impacts; and that
economic, social, and other considerations relevant to MOBILITY 2030 outweighed the unavoidable adverse effects of the project.

An Addendum to the FEIR was issued by SANDAG in January 2005. That addendum changed the references to State Route (SR) 241 from a four-lane toll road plus two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to an eight-lane toll facility. SANDAG determined that this action did not result in substantial changes to the program nor did it require major revisions to the FEIR, and that there would not be new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the FEIR.

2.2 REASONS FOR THE UPDATE

The Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 consists of an integrated program of capital and operational construction projects to assure the implementation of MOBILITY 2030. This RTP update is subject to the transportation bill known as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or TEA-21, which requires SANDAG to update its long-range transportation plan and air quality conformity every three years. Future RTP updates will be subject to the new federal transportation law known as Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The proposed Plan satisfies that requirement, and revises or eliminates certain projects or operational improvements in the Systems Development component, based on refinements of transportation modeling, increased projected costs of construction, and updated revenue forecasts.

Since 2003, three key items have occurred that shape the proposed Plan. The first is the extension of the TransNet beyond 2008, leading to an Early Action Program of projects that is included in the proposed Plan. The second is an updated forecast of funding sources through the year 2030, to include the additional TransNet dollars. And finally, project cost estimates have been revised to reflect the dynamic changes in our economy since 2003. One additional change also included in the proposed Plan is updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecast, which was adopted after MOBILITY 2030 was adopted.
3.0 AUTHORITY AND DETERMINATION

This Supplement to the FEIR for MOBILITY 2030 has been prepared under the authority of Section 15163 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. SANDAG, acting as the Lead Agency for the proposed Project, reviewed the proposed Project and the FEIR for MOBILITY 2030 and found that the circumstances under which the project was undertaken had substantially changed and that there was new information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known at the time the FEIR was certified. Those changes involved the use of a new transportation modeling methodology (discussed in Section 4.3 below), increased projected costs of construction, and updated revenue forecasts.

To evaluate the changes described in the preceding paragraph, SANDAG prepared an Environmental Initial Study (IS). The IS determined that changes in the FEIR required to assess the proposed Plan would be needed in the Project Description outline above (Section 1.0) and the Traffic/Circulation section (Chapter 4.4) of the FEIR, and that only minor changes to that section would be necessary to make the FEIR adequately apply to the proposed Plan. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15163 of CEQA, SANDAG determined that a Supplement to the FEIR (a Supplemental EIR), would be the appropriate environmental review document for the proposed Plan. The process leading to this determination is more fully explained in Section 1.2 of the IS. The IS is attached to this Supplemental EIR as Attachment A.

Section 15163 states that the supplement needs to “contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised;” that the “supplement shall be given the same kind of notice and public review” required by CEQA for a draft EIR under Section 15087 of the CEQA Guidelines; that the supplement “may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR;” and that in deciding whether to approve the revised project, “the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR.”

The attached IS examines the environmental effects of the proposed Plan in relation to the environmental analysis in the FEIR in order to determine changes necessary to the FEIR. According to the IS, the only substantial changes in the environmental analysis sections of the FEIR due to the proposed Plan would be in the Traffic/Circulation section. No new significant effects were identified when comparing the proposed Plan to existing conditions as described in the FEIR. As with the adopted MOBILITY 2030, the proposed Plan would result in a significant improvement in traffic, transit, and congestion relief compared to the no project scenario. However, because of a cutback in the Systems Development projects that would occur with
implementation of the proposed Plan, the proposed Plan would result in some increase in street, highway, and freeway congestion and a reduction in transit efficiency (measured by access times to transit) compared to adopted MOBILITY 2030. Changes to the Traffic/Circulation section necessary to make the FEIR adequate for environmental review of the proposed Plan are presented in the next section of this SEIR. No change in the identification of impacts or the mitigation requirements in the FEIR will be necessary.
4.0 CHANGES TO FEIR TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION SECTION

4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Minor changes in this section are due to the availability of updated information in the description of transportation service and regulations. Those changes are as follows, with insertions underlined and deletions struck through.

In the section headed “Regional Transportation System,” no changes are necessary.

In the section headed “Intermodal Service,” the following changes are necessary.

Goods movement in the San Diego region is provided via truck travel on the region's roadway system as well as by air, rail, pipeline, and seaport. Lindbergh Field serves as the primary airport for the movement of the goods transported by air. Freight rail service within the San Diego region is provided via the BNSF and SDIV railroads with Carrizo Gorge Railway operating between Tijuana and Tecate, Baja California. Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, LP provides pipeline transportation and terminal services for petroleum customers in the region. The region’s seaports at Tenth Avenue in San Diego and National City are located on San Diego Bay and is operated by the San Diego Unified Port District.

Overall, in fiscal year 2001, the volume of maritime cargo increased by 4 percent over the previous year. Currently, approximately 2.75 million tons of maritime cargo are handled annually by the Port of San Diego. Inbound cargoes include refrigerated commodities, fertilizer, cement, break bulk commodities, and forest products such as newsprint and lumber, and automobiles. Main export cargoes include refrigerated cargo; break bulk; and bulk commodities such as soda ash, sodium sulfate, and borax. In the past 4 years, bulk tonnage has steadily increased from 157,000 to 744,000 metric tons annually.

The San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway connects San Diego to Tijuana and Tecate in Baja California. The SDIV Railroad provides freight service between San Diego and San Ysidro. In 2001, Carrizo Gorge Railway took over operations between Tijuana and Tecate. Main commodities moved include liquefied petroleum gas, lumber, beverages, paper, grain, and sand.
The extension of existing freight service between San Diego and Tecate to the Imperial Valley is being considered by rehabilitating the 70-mile Desert Line portion of the SD&AE, which has been out of service since 1983. In May 2002, MTDB granted a contract to Carrizo Gorge Railway to repair, operate, and maintain the Desert Line. In January 2005, with minimum repairs, the Desert Line re-opened for limited freight service. The connection with the Union Pacific Railroad in Imperial Valley would links San Diego and its port to the rest of the United States and Mexico, and vastly improves the region’s market opportunities.

In the section headed “Regulatory Framework,” changes are necessary only in the first paragraph under the subheading “Federal Regulations, as follows.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), signed into law in 1998, provides the regulatory framework at the federal level for transportation planning in urban areas. Under TEA-21, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) requires that Metropolitan Planning Organizations, like SANDAG, prepare long-range transportation plans. In federally designated air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, the long-range transportation plan is to be updated every three years. SANDAG adopted the 2020 RTP in April 2000. When adopted, the In March 2003, MOBILITY 2030 RTP will replaced the 2020 RTP as the San Diego region's long-range transportation plan.

4.2 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

There are no changes to the significance criteria used in the FEIR, and no changes to this section of the FEIR are necessary. For this SEIR, as well as for the FEIR, a significant impact would occur in any of the following cases:

- the percent of daily VMT at level of service E or F increased from the 2030 No Project condition to the 2030 RTP condition.

- the percent of work and higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes by transit decreased from the 2030 No Project condition to the 2030 RTP condition.

- the percent of nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit decreased from the 2030 No Project condition to the 2030 RTP condition.
4.3 IMPACT ANALYSIS

In this section of the FEIR, the impact analysis rests on the data presented in Table 4.4-1. That table presents the significance criteria data, and compares the adopted MOBILITY 2030 plan to conditions in 2000 and to conditions that would occur in 2030 under the FEIR’s No Project Alternative, as follows.

Table 4.4-1
Transportation Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Scenario Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2000 Existing Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Daily VMT at LOS E or F</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of work/higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes by transit</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this SEIR, SANDAG staff again computed a comparison of the same criteria for the proposed Plan, the 2000 existing conditions, and the 2030 no project scenario. The results are shown in the table below. It should be noted that the baseline data for Year 2000 Existing Conditions and Year 2030 No Project are different in the FEIR and the SEIR. The reasons for the differing baseline data are described in detail following the table.

Proposed Plan Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Scenario Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2000 Existing Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Daily VMT at LOS E or F</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of work/higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes by transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data are different in the two tables for the 2000 condition and the 2030 no project condition. The following factors account for the difference.

Since the 2003 RTP was produced, a number of enhancements to the transportation models have been made to streamline operation and improve model accuracy. The models were transferred
from TRANPLAN transportation modeling software to TransCAD, which has reduced model execution times and enables more complex modeling procedures to be implemented. For example, a multiple feedback loop trip distribution model better reflects the effects of traffic congestion on travel patterns, a more elaborate toll modeling procedure has improved estimates of HOV/managed lane use, and highway assignment procedures that account for intersection delays have produced more realistic traffic volume forecasts.

In addition to procedural changes, transportation databases have also been improved. For example, GPS-based travel survey is available and was used to modify trip rates in the trip generation model and highway speed assumptions in the highway assignment model. A new on-board transit survey was used to recalibrate the mode choice model parameters to improve transit ridership estimates. Year 2000 U.S. Census population statistics became available and were used in the growth forecasting process to improve trip generation forecasts. Finally, transportation network databases are continually being refined as new information becomes available, such as 2005 digital aerial photography which was used in an extensive review of highway network assumptions.

Because of the difference in modeling, the data in the two tables are not directly comparable. However, according to the FEIR significance criteria, both plans would result in improved conditions compared to the 2030 No Project scenario. The FEIR states that “(w)hile there would be more people and cars in the future, implementation of the 2030 RTP would result in a less congested roadway system and a more accessible transit system than the No Project condition.” Likewise, the proposed Plan would result in a less congested roadway system and a more accessible transit system than the No Project condition. By the criteria of significance stated in the FEIR, the proposed Plan would not have significant impacts on transportation/circulation.

In Table 4.4-1, The Transportation Impact Analysis indicates that Percent of Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled at Level of Service E or F would improve from 29 percent under the Year 2030 No Project to 17 percent for Year 2030 RTP (MOBILITY 2030) Project. This represents a 41 percent decrease of VMT at LOS E or F with implementation of MOBILITY 2030. Considering the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update, daily VMT at LOS E or F would improve from 24 percent VMT to 15 percent, which represents a 37 percent decrease in congestion. While this is an improvement over the 2030 No Project condition, it is not as great an improvement as compared to MOBILITY 2030.

Similarly, percent of work/higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes by transit increased in both MOBILITY 2030 and the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update. As indicated in Table 4.4-1, under MOBILITY 2030, those trips accessible in 30 minutes by transit increased
7 percent (2030 No Project) to 12 percent (2030 RTP Project) representing a 71% increase. In the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update, the percent of trips increased from 9 percent (2030 No Project) to 13 percent (2030 Proposed Plan), which represents a 55 percent increase. While work/higher education trips accessible within 30 minutes by transit increase under both scenarios, the increase is greater under the MOBILITY 2030 RTP.

Finally, percent of nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit in both MOBILITY 2030 and the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update increase. As indicated by Table 4.4-1 under MOBILITY 2030, those nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit increase from 2 percent (2030 No Project) to 5 percent (2030 RTP Project), representing a 150 percent increase. In the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update, the percent nonwork trips accessible in 15 minutes by transit increase from 5 percent (2030 No Project) to 7 percent (2030 Proposed Plan), which represents a 40 percent increase. While nonwork trips accessible within 15 minutes by transit increase under both scenarios, the increase is greater under the MOBILITY 2030 RTP.

Compared to the adopted MOBILITY 2030 plan, the proposed Plan would not show as great a degree of improvement in the criteria conditions. This is principally due to revenue constraints and cost factors, as explained in the IS (Attachment A), which caused a number of Systems Development projects to be cut back or eliminated under the proposed Plan.

4.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

Like adopted MOBILITY 2030, the proposed Plan “is considered to be beneficial in terms of its impact on the regional transportation system” as stated in this section of the FEIR. No changes to this section of the FEIR are necessary.

4.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

Adoption and implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in significant transportation impacts by the criteria of significance in the FEIR, so no mitigation is required. No changes to this section of the FEIR are necessary.

4.6 RESIDUAL IMPACTS

At the program planning level, there would be no residual transportation/circulation impacts. No changes to this section of the FEIR are necessary.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSIONS

OVERVIEW

In April 2005, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors approved a work program and schedule for updating the current 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), known as MOBILITY 2030. The last RTP update was completed in March 2003, and the next regularly scheduled update is due to be completed in March 2006. This 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan: 2006 Update, hereinafter referred to as “the proposed Plan,” will serve to satisfy requirements for reporting air quality conformity analysis every three years by updating MOBILITY 2030.

A Final EIR (FEIR) addressing MOBILITY 2030 was certified in March 2003. An Addendum to the FEIR was issued by SANDAG in January 2005. That addendum changed the references to State Route (SR) 241 from a four-lane toll road plus two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to an eight-lane toll facility\(^1\). SANDAG determined that this action did not result in substantial changes to the program nor did it require major revisions to the FEIR, and that there would not be new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the FEIR.

The proposed project (the proposed Plan), revises or eliminates certain projects in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 in accordance with recent calculations of project costs and a new evaluation of revenue constraints. Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), SANDAG is the Lead Agency and is charged with the responsibility of deciding whether to approve the proposed project. This Initial Study document evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed Plan to determine the appropriate form of environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA. Based on the Initial Study findings, SANDAG has prepared and will circulate a Supplemental EIR disclosing the new major impacts of the Plan for the issue of traffic/circulation.

BACKGROUND

On March 23, 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted MOBILITY 2030, The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region as the RTP. The RTP is a comprehensive plan for major transportation projects in San Diego County through 2030. The plan adopted from among several alternatives was based on reasonably expected funding and implementation cost projections.

\(^1\) An HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lane refers to an exclusive road or traffic lane limited to HOVs that typically have a higher operating speed and lower traffic volumes than a general purpose or mixed flow lane. In California, vehicles that typically can use HOV lanes include carpools, vanpools, buses, other multipassenger vehicles, certain fuel-efficient vehicles, motorcycles, and emergency vehicles.
MOBILITY 2030 has four major components. These are:

- **Land Use** – a projected land use pattern
- **Systems Development** – a network to move people and goods, consisting primarily of highways, roadways, and transit services
- **Systems Management** – strategies to improve transportation system efficiency
- **Demand Management** – measures to reduce congestion during highest demand

The proposed Plan revises only the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030; that is, the list of projects that are to be constructed to help realize the objectives of the plan. The other three components are unchanged.

New and higher cost projections, along with updated revenue forecasts, have led to the development of a revised Systems Development component, with a general reduction in the scope of projects, including elimination of some projects. The proposed system is intermittently reviewed by SANDAG and the projections of cost are refined periodically. A number of factors that influence the construction costs of future transportation facilities have risen sharply since the adoption of MOBILITY 2030 in 2003. The two major factors are the costs of construction materials and the costs of right-of-way acquisition.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN**


The FEIR addressed potential impacts that would be associated with the transportation projects required for implementation of MOBILITY 2030 (also referred to as 2030 RTP) in the San Diego region. The FEIR determined that, after implementation of mitigation measures, development of projects in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 would have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with visual and biological resources.

The SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for MOBILITY 2030 on March 23, 2003. Having considered the unavoidable adverse impacts of MOBILITY 2030, the SANDAG Board of Directors determined that the project’s unavoidable impacts could not be further reduced and that all feasible mitigation had been provided to avoid or reduce the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR; that no additional feasible mitigation was available to further reduce significant impacts; and that economic, social, and other considerations relevant to MOBILITY 2030 outweighed the unavoidable adverse effects of the project.
Project benefits were found to include:

- The 2030 RTP would achieve increased mobility by improving the movement of people and goods.
- The 2030 RTP would improve average travel speed for transit.
- The 2030 RTP would improve the reliability of the transportation system by reducing congestion of the freeway network.
- The 2030 RTP would also benefit freeway congestion during peak periods.
- The 2030 RTP would reduce the peak-period travel by single-occupant vehicles and encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.
- The 2030 RTP would result in a higher work trip mode split during peak periods among carpool, transit, and bike/walk trips.
- The 2030 RTP would increase accessibility of the transportation system.
- The 2030 RTP would improve access to employment, shopping, and services in all parts of the region.
- The 2030 RTP would provide a well-balanced mix of freeway and arterial improvements to reduce regional and local congestion and transit improvements to increase ridership and provide enhanced public transportation opportunities.
- The 2030 RTP would dramatically reduce air quality emissions in 2030 compared to current conditions, reflecting improvement in fuels and emissions technologies over time.

In 2005, review by SANDAG staff indicated that the cost of the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 would exceed the projections used in 2003. SANDAG staff revised the cost estimates along with the revenue forecasts and prepared the proposed Plan. This Initial Study determines the appropriate form of CEQA documentation to support adoption of the proposed Plan. Based on criteria in the state CEQA Guidelines, this Initial Study determined that a Supplemental EIR would be the appropriate environmental document. Due to reduction in the capacity of the transportation system, significant impacts on traffic/circulation would result from the proposed Plan as compared to the 2030 RTP. No other potentially significant and unavoidable impacts were found to be associated with the proposed Plan that had not been identified in the FEIR. Except for the impacts on traffic/circulation, the Initial Study indicated that the significant impacts of the proposed Plan would be no more severe than determined by the FEIR.
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE INITIAL STUDY

Based on the project description in Chapter 2.0 of this Initial Study, each of the issues addressed in the FEIR, as well as each of the issues contained in the checklist presented in Chapter 3.0 of this document, have been evaluated, leading to the following findings and conclusions.

- The proposed Plan implements the objectives of MOBILITY 2030, which guides the development in the RTP for San Diego County.

- Projects in the Systems Development component are required to be consistent with the objectives of MOBILITY 2030.

- The FEIR sets forth mitigation measures that reduce the impacts of the implementation of the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 to below a level of significance, with the exception of biological and visual resources.

- Projects in the Systems Development component are required to implement applicable mitigation measures of the FEIR.

- The analysis in this Initial Study indicates that, except for traffic/circulation in comparison to the 2030 RTP, the only significant impacts that will result from the proposed Plan are those that were previously identified in the FEIR. Compared to baseline 2000 conditions, the proposed Plan would not result in additional significant impacts.

- The proposed Plan will not result in any significant unavoidable impacts except for those that were previously identified in the FEIR (visual and biological resources), except for traffic/circulation impacts in comparison to the 2030 RTP.

- The analysis in this Initial Study indicates that, except for impacts related to traffic/circulation, the significant impacts of the proposed Plan will not be more severe than those examined in the FEIR.

- In analyzing the impacts of the proposed Plan, this Initial Study did not find that any mitigation measures that were previously believed to be infeasible could, in fact, be implemented, substantially reducing one or more significant effects of the proposed project.

- There is no evidence of the existence of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR that would substantially reduce the significant effects of MOBILITY 2030 that SANDAG has declined to implement.

- Based on this Initial Study and the information contained therein, the evidence is that the environmental review of the proposed Plan will require only minor changes in the
analysis of the FEIR, and that a Supplemental EIR should be prepared to address the potentially significant traffic/circulation impacts of the proposed Plan.

This Initial Study relies on use of an Environmental Checklist form as suggested in Section 15063(d)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 3.0 of this document contains the checklist form and explains the basis for each response to the questions on the form.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and the State and local CEQA Guidelines, SANDAG is the Lead Agency and is charged with the responsibility of deciding whether to approve the proposed project, the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): 2006 Update, hereinafter referred to as the proposed Plan, as a revision of the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030, The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region (MOBILITY 2030). In 2003, SANDAG adopted MOBILITY 2030 as the Regional Transportation Plan for the San Diego region. Based on refinement of transportation modeling, increased projected costs of construction, and updated revenue forecasts, SANDAG has revised the Systems Development component of the RTP to reflect the proposed Plan with its revised list of projects. This document evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed Plan compared to both the FEIR baseline (2000) and the adopted Systems Development component (MOBILITY 2030), as appropriate, and determines the appropriate form of environmental documentation pursuant to CEQA.

1.1 BACKGROUND

On March 23, 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted MOBILITY 2030 as the 2030 RTP. The 2030 RTP is a comprehensive plan for major transportation projects in San Diego County through 2030. The plan, adopted from among several alternatives, was based on reasonably expected funding and implementation cost projections.

MOBILITY 2030 has four major components. These are:

- **Land Use**: A projected land use distribution pattern to guide development of the transportation network.

- **Systems Development**: A multimodal network for the movement of people and goods, consisting principally of three categories: highways, regional arterials and roadways, and regional/corridor transit services.

- **Systems Management**: Strategies to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

- **Demand Management**: Measures to reduce trips and thus congestion on the transportation system during the periods of highest demand.

New and higher cost projections, along with updated revenue forecasts, have led to the development of a revised Systems Development component, with a general reduction in the scope of projects, including elimination of some projects. The proposed system is reviewed by SANDAG and the projections of cost are refined periodically. A number of factors that influence the construction costs of future transportation facilities have risen sharply since the
adoption of MOBILITY 2030 in 2003. The two major factors are the costs of construction materials and the costs of right-of-way acquisition.

The proposed Plan revises only the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030; that is, the list of projects that are to be constructed to help realize the objectives of the plan. The other three components are unchanged, except that the Land Use component uses the Final 2030 Regional Growth Forecast, adopted in December 2003, rather than the Preliminary 2030 Regional Growth Forecast used in MOBILITY 2030. That minor change does not make a significant difference in the assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed Plan.

1.1.1 Objectives of MOBILITY 2030

MOBILITY 2030 represents the transportation policy and action statement of SANDAG to meet the region’s long-term mobility needs, to better connect transportation and land use policy decisions, and to create a transportation network that will serve the region through the year 2030. MOBILITY 2030 is intended to result in a transportation network that can meet the changing socioeconomic and technological conditions of the region while preserving, to the extent possible, the environment that helps define San Diego’s quality of life. At the core of MOBILITY 2030 are the seven broad policy goals listed below. Of the seven, mobility is considered the plan’s highest goal.

- **Mobility** Improve the mobility of people and freight
- **Accessibility** Improve accessibility to major employment and other regional activity centers
- **Reliability** Improve the reliability of the transportation system
- **Efficiency** Maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system
- **Livability** Promote livable communities
- **Sustainability** Minimize effects on the environment
- **Equity** Ensure an equitable distribution of the benefits among various demographic and user groups

1.1.2 Previous Environmental Documentation


That FEIR addressed potential impacts associated with the projects that would be implemented pursuant to MOBILITY 2030 within the San Diego region. The FEIR determined, after mitigation, that implementation of MOBILITY 2030 would result in significant, potentially unmitigable environmental impacts to visual resources and biological resources. It also
identified cumulatively considerable impacts to land use, visual resources, water resources, and biological resources.

The FEIR found that potentially significant and unmitigable visual impacts could occur if proposed alignments or facilities required large cut and fill slopes or noise barriers; blocked views from adjacent areas or intruded into important vistas along roadways (via noise walls or facilities themselves); and/or changed the scale, character, and quality of designated or eligible scenic highway corridors. Proposed rail improvements, such as double-tracking in the coastal corridor, could result in significant visual impacts.

The FEIR found that potentially significant and unmitigable biological impacts could result from double-tracking of the railroad and Interstate 5 (I-5) improvements along the coastal corridor. Those projects would result in impacts to the lagoon systems as well as certain coastal bluff locations. These are highly sensitive locations that support sensitive habitat and species. Until the specific biological impacts are quantified and feasible mitigation is identified, this impact would remain significant and unmitigated.

The SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Statements of Facts and Findings and Overriding Considerations for MOBILITY 2030 on March 23, 2003. Having considered the unavoidable adverse impacts of MOBILITY 2030 as identified in the FEIR, the SANDAG Board of Directors determined that the project’s significant unavoidable impacts could not be further reduced, that all feasible mitigation had been provided to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the FEIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation was available to further reduce significant impacts. The SANDAG Board adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations concerning MOBILITY 2030’s unavoidable significant impacts to explain why the plan’s benefits overrode and outweighed its unavoidable impacts, as follows.

SANDAG hereby declares that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has identified and discussed significant effects that may occur as a result of the Project. With implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the EIR, these effects can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for irreversible significant impacts as discussed in Section IV of these Findings. Significant unavoidable and unmitigable impacts would occur to visual and biological resources and there would be cumulatively significant impacts to land use, visual resources, water resources, and biological resources.

SANDAG hereby declares that it has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the potential impacts resulting from the Project.

SANDAG hereby declares that to the extent any mitigation measures recommended in the EIR could not be incorporated, such mitigation measures are infeasible because they would impose restrictions on the Project that would prohibit the realization of specific legal, economic, social, and other benefits that SANDAG finds outweighs the unmitigated impacts. SANDAG further finds that except for the Project, all other alternatives set forth in the EIR are infeasible because they would prohibit the realization of Project
objectives and/or of specific legal, economic, social, and other benefits that SANDAG finds outweigh any environmental benefits of the alternatives.

SANDAG hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the Project to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation measures, having considered the entire administrative record on the Project, and having weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable adverse impacts after mitigation, SANDAG has determined that the following legal, economic, social, and environmental benefits of the Project outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse impacts and render those potential adverse environmental impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations:

Project Benefits:

At the core of the 2030 RTP are seven broad policy goals that address the project’s long-term mobility needs to better connect transportation and land use policy decisions and to create a transportation network that would serve the region through the year 2030. The 2030 RTP achieves these goals in the following manner:

- The 2030 RTP achieves increased mobility by improving the movement of people and goods. Average travel times are one minute longer than current conditions, even with one million more people and half million more jobs in 2030. The average automobile travel speed for work trips during peak periods would be 28.3 miles per hour (mph) under the 2030 RTP network. Commuters using the extensive Managed/HOV lane system will benefit from the higher average speeds.

- Average travel speed would also be improved for transit travel under the 2030 RTP. Transit work trips are 4 miles per hour faster than current conditions with an average speed of 13.8 mph.

- The 2030 RTP improves the reliability of the transportation system by reducing congestion of the freeway network. The 2030 RTP would reduce the percentage of daily vehicle miles traveled at LOS E (or worse) from 20 percent under current conditions to 17 percent.

- The 2030 RTP would also benefit freeway congestion during peak periods. The 2030 RTP’s peak period vehicle miles traveled at LOS E (or worse) would be 25 percent, which is 4 percent less compared to current conditions. This would improve accessibility to major employment and other regional activity centers.

- The 2030 RTP would reduce the peak-period travel by single-occupant vehicles and encourage the use of alternative transportation modes. The proposed project provides support for alternative modes of transportation. The 2030 RTP would result in 63 percent of homes within 0.5 mile of a transit stop. The significant expansion of regional transit services would increase the transit ridership; daily transit passenger
miles (5.2 million) are three times higher compared to current conditions. In addition, 45 percent of jobs will be located within 0.25 mile of a transit stop.

- The 2030 RTP would result in a higher work trip mode split during peak periods among carpool, transit, and bike/walk trips. Under MOBILITY 2030, 27 percent of peak period work trips would be non-drive-alone trips whereas currently, only 22 percent are non-drive-alone trips. The mode split for transit in the MOBILITY 2030 Plan is 11 percent.

- The 2030 RTP would increase accessibility of the transportation system. Under the 2030 RTP, 67 percent of work and higher education trips would be accessible in 30 minutes during peak periods versus 71 percent in current conditions.

- The 2030 RTP would better improve access to employment, shopping, and services in all parts of the region. The proposed project would bring home, work, and services together and help eliminate the need for long commuter trips. This is consistent with SANDAG’s regional growth management strategy effort, REGION2020, and concepts being developed for the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and with the 2030 Preliminary Cities/County Forecast, as well as the movement of local jurisdictions to a smart growth land use pattern.

- The 2030 RTP would provide a well-balanced mix of freeway and arterial improvements to reduce regional and local congestion and transit improvements to increase ridership and provide enhanced public transportation opportunities.

- Air quality emissions in 2030 are dramatically reduced compared to current conditions, reflecting improvement in fuels and emissions technologies over time. Smog forming pollutants would be reduced from 244 tons per day for current conditions to 43.4 tons/day under the 2030 RTP.

SANDAG hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the EIR outweighs the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the Project that cannot be mitigated. SANDAG finds that each of the Project benefits outweighs the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts acceptable.

### 1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, this Initial Study has been prepared to determine whether updating MOBILITY 2030 by adopting the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan: 2006 Update as a revision of MOBILITY 2030 would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts than were addressed in the FEIR for MOBILITY 2030. If so, a Subsequent EIR or Supplement to the previous EIR (Supplemental EIR) would be prepared. This Initial Study examines the provisions of Section 21166 of CEQA and Sections 15162 and 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines. Those sections deal
with the situation that occurs when changes have occurred in a project, in the circumstances affecting a project, or in the information relevant to a project, require a reevaluation of the environmental analysis in a previously prepared EIR for the project.

1.2.1 Use of a Subsequent EIR, a Supplemental EIR, or an Addendum to a Previously Certified EIR

Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines identifies the conditions that require preparation of a Subsequent EIR. If an EIR has been certified for a project, a Subsequent EIR should be prepared if the Lead Agency determines that a change affecting the environmental analysis has occurred and if:

1. *The change in the project is substantial.* Substantial changes in the project are those that would require “major revisions of the previous EIR … due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.”

2. *The circumstances under which the project is undertaken have substantially changed.* Substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken are those defined as those that would “require major revisions of the previous EIR … due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.”

3. *There is new information of substantial importance,* which was not known and could have not been known, with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified, that shows:
   A. “The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR…;
   B. “Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
   C. “Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   D. “Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.”

If the conditions identified above are met, the Lead Agency may choose to prepare a Supplemental, rather than a Subsequent, EIR pursuant to the provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15163 if “only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.”
If none of the conditions set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 are met, the Lead Agency is not permitted to require preparation of a Subsequent EIR. Rather, the Lead Agency may require preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration or an Addendum, or the Lead Agency may decide that no further environmental documentation is necessary.

This Initial Study has evaluated each of the issues addressed in the Final EIR, as well as each of the issues contained in the checklist presented in Section 3.0 of this document.

- The analysis contained in this Initial Study indicates that in addition to the significant impacts of the project identified in the FEIR, the proposed project may have significant impacts on traffic/circulation that were not identified in the previous EIR.

- The analysis contained in this Initial Study also indicates that the significant impacts that were previously analyzed in the FEIR may be substantially more severe than those examined in the previous FEIR with respect to traffic/circulation.

- In analyzing the impacts of the proposed project, this Initial Study did not find that any mitigation measures previously believed to be infeasible could, in fact, be implemented, substantially reducing one or more significant effects of the project.

- There is no evidence of the existence of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR that would substantially reduce significant effects of the proposed project and that SANDAG has declined to implement.

- Based on this analysis and the information contained herein, there is evidence that the environmental analysis of the proposed project requires only minor changes to the FEIR.

This Initial Study relies on use of an Environmental Checklist Form (Form), as suggested in Section 15063 (d) (3) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The Form is used:

- To evaluate whether there are any new or more severe significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project; and

- To review whether there is new information or circumstances that would require preparation of additional environmental documentation in the form of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR, or if an Addendum is appropriate.

Section 3.0 of this document contains the Form and explains the basis for each response to the questions on the Form.
1.3 CONTACT PERSON

The Lead Agency for the Initial Study is SANDAG. Any questions about the preparation of this Initial Study, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Rob Rundle
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 699-6949
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

MOBILITY 2030, adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in March 2003, includes a Systems Development component of integrated capital and operational improvements to be constructed to assure the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The proposed Plan revises or eliminates certain projects or operational improvements in the Systems Development component in accordance with new calculations of project cost and a new evaluation of revenue constraints.

The proposed Plan represents a technical update to MOBILITY 2030. MOBILITY 2030 was based on a $42 billion Reasonably Expected funding scenario that included the then proposed extension of the TransNet half-cent sales tax. MOBILITY 2030 also contained a $30 billion Revenue Constrained Scenario, an alternative required by federal law as the basis for analyzing the air quality impacts of the long-range transportation plan. By updating MOBILITY 2030 in 2006, the region would satisfy the existing federal law that requires SANDAG to update its long-range transportation plan and air quality conformity every three years.

Since 2003, three key items have occurred that shape the proposed Plan. The first is the extension of the TransNet past 2008, leading to an Early Action Program of projects that is included in the proposed Plan. The second is an updated forecast of funding sources through the year 2030, to include the additional TransNet dollars. And finally, project cost estimates have been revised to reflect the dynamic changes in our economy since 2003. One minor change also included in the proposed Plan is updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecasts, which were adopted for planning purposes after MOBILITY 2030.

The proposed project requires the following approval by SANDAG:

- Approval of the proposed Plan as the Systems Development component of the Regional Transportation Plan.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

2.2.1 Location

Projects in the revised Systems Development component of the proposed Plan are located in roughly the western third of San Diego County. All of the projects were included in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030.

2.2.2 Physical Setting

The San Diego region includes three general physiographic regions: coastal, montane, and desert. The highest population densities are found in the western third (coastal) of the region.
where topography and mild coastal climatic conditions have attracted intensive development. Consequently, existing transportation infrastructure is most concentrated and diverse in the populated coastal areas to meet the needs of the greatest number of people.

The 2030 RTP provides the planning foundation for transportation improvements that take into consideration the San Diego region as well as areas outside the region’s boundaries. The area supports an existing network of freeways, expressways, regional arterials, transit corridors, regional bus and rail transit corridors, bikeways, commercial and general aviation facilities, seaport facilities, and ports-of-entry at the United States-Mexico border. These facilities serve the region’s 19 local jurisdictions, as well as interregional and international commuting.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed transportation network in the 2030 RTP (SANDAG 2002, 2003) is the basis of evaluation in this study. Figure 2-1 (at the end of Chapter 2.0) shows the proposed Plan network. The transportation network was developed around four main components: (1) Land Use, (2) Systems Development, (3) Systems Management, and (4) Demand Management. Each component has a unique role in improving mobility and travel in the San Diego region through the year 2030.

The Systems Development component of the 2030 RTP provides a blueprint to improve the regional transportation system for the more efficient movement of people and goods. The proposed project is a revision of the Systems Development component that was adopted by SANDAG in 2003. It consists of changes in certain transit and highway improvements to be implemented as part of MOBILITY 2030. These are described in more detail in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

2.3.1 Transit Projects

The proposed transit improvement projects included in the proposed Plan are listed in Table 2-1. The regional transit network is shown in Figure 2-2 (at the end of Chapter 2.0). The goal of the enhanced transit program is to provide an attractive alternative to the use of a single occupant automobile and to provide needed transportation to people who do not own or operate a car. The proposed plan includes new transit routes that would operate at higher speeds in the year 2030. Spacing stations farther apart than current transit services achieves these higher transit speeds. New stations would be integrated into central activity areas that include pedestrian and bicycle-friendly components. The proposed transit services include the use of a new type of transit vehicle known as flex trolleys or “trains on tires.” This type of low-floor vehicle has the flexibility of buses while offering operational characteristics similar to rail systems. It also allows for the use of smart fare cards to allow for easier and speedier boarding.
Table 2-1  
Transit Services in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Peak Headway (minutes)**</th>
<th>Off-Peak Headway (minutes)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Increase in Coaster</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Increase in Sprinter Rail - North County Fair (Rail)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Temecula to Sorrento Mesa via Mira Mesa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>NE Oceanside to UTC via El Camino Real/I-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Increase in Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Increase in Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Increase in Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Mid-Coast LRT to Sorrento Mesa (Transitway)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Escondido to Centre City/SDIA via I-15/SR 94 (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard to Centre City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Old Town to Balboa via Mission Blvd</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>32nd St to Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Coronado &amp; Centre City to Sorrento Mesa via Hillcrest/Genesee Avenue (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>H Street to SW College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Centre City to Otay Mesa via SR 94/I-805</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC Super Loop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>El Cajon to UTC via SR 52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Sorrento Mesa via I-805/I-15 (Transitway)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.

**Peak headways at 15 minutes to Escondido and 30 minutes to Temecula; off-peak headways at 30 minutes to Escondido and 60 minutes to Temecula.

Table 2-1 shows the differences in transit services between the proposed Plan and adopted MOBILITY 2030. Changes between the two scenarios are indicated by strikeout and shading. Strikeout indicates items in adopted MOBILITY 2030 that would change, have been completed, or would be eliminated; shading indicates changes proposed in the proposed Plan. For example, transit route 611 would be operated differently under the proposed Plan as compared to adopted MOBILITY 2030, so headway would increase by 5 minutes.

Table 2-2 shows the changes in the transit capital improvement projects between the adopted MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan. Projects that have been completed, modified, or would be eliminated from the adopted plan in the proposed plan are shown in strikeout. Early Action/Transit First Now Projects have been reprioritized in the proposed Plan, but are not new projects.
**Table 2-2**
Transit Improvements in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Adjacent Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East Trolley Extension</td>
<td>Mission Valley East Extension is an extension of the San Diego Trolley light rail system from its current terminus in Mission Valley at Mission San Diego 5.9 miles to Grossmont Center. Stations include an underground station at San Diego State University.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido Sprinter Rail Double-Tracking and North County Fair Extension</td>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido-Sprinter Rail project is a 24-mile light rail line serving the SR 78 corridor, now under construction and planned to open in 2007. This service will be a single-track system with 15 stations including Oceanside and Escondido Transit Centers, Palomar College, and Cal State San Marcos. The proposed Plan calls for double-tracking that line, increased service frequencies, and an extension from the Escondido Transit Center to North County Fair.</td>
<td>Oceanside Vista San Marcos Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa Transitway</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa Transitway is a grade-separated transit-only facility in the Sorrento Mesa/University City area of San Diego.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa Transitway</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa Transitway is a grade separated transit only facility in the Sorrento Mesa/University City area of San Diego.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail is an extension of the San Diego Trolley from the Old Town Transit Center, along I-5 to University City and along the Sorrento Mesa Transitway.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Double-Tracking and Other Improvements</td>
<td>Coastal Rail double-tracking includes a number of double-tracking and related projects along the coastal rail line between Oceanside and downtown San Diego. These include siding projects, bridge replacements, safety improvements, and passenger enhancements planned to benefit services using the coastal rail corridor (i.e., Coaster, Amtrak, and freight). Double-tracking is also proposed along the Sprinter alignment.</td>
<td>Oceanside Carlsbad Encinitas Solana Beach Del Mar San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnels at University City and Del Mar</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnels at University City and Del Mar would provide better reliability, safety, and travel time savings to the rail services using the coastal rail corridor.</td>
<td>Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Light Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>Other Regional Rail Grade Separations include a number of grade separations along the current Blue Line Trolley, between San Ysidro and downtown San Diego, and the Sprinter rail line. Exact locations are to be determined at a later date.</td>
<td>Chula Vista San Diego Oceanside Escondido Vista San Marcos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Action/Transit First Now</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Adjacent Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Transit First Priority Measures Projects (These projects were in MOBILITY 2030 but are reprioritized in the proposed Plan.)</td>
<td>Transit improvements considered Early Action/Transit First Now would include transit priority measures (e.g., signal priority, queue jumpers), real-time/next-bus information at stations, next-generation vehicles, and other station and service improvements that could be implemented over the short term to enhance existing and future transit services.</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers</td>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers are either improvements to existing or the construction of new transit centers. These include design features like shelters, landscaping, and integration with the local community; advanced systems like real-time information; and pedestrian-friendly features. Additional parking is provided at a number of these stations.</td>
<td>All Jurisdictions except for Imperial Beach Del Mar Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Access Ramps to Managed/HOV Lanes</td>
<td>Direct access ramps to Managed/HOV lanes provide a direct connection for transit from the HOV or managed lanes on the freeway to the transit center.</td>
<td>San Diego Chula Vista National City Santee Encinitas Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles for New Regional and Corridor Transit Services</td>
<td>Rail vehicles for new regional transit services could include a variety of different vehicles such as light and commuter rail vehicles, articulated bus, standard bus, or flex trolleys.</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial BRT Transit Priority Improvements</td>
<td>These improvements enable transit to bypass traffic-choked areas on major arterials. They can include signal priority, grade-separated intersections, or queue jumper lanes. Exact locations along a given route would be determined at a later date.</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.

1 Indicates project has been completed.

### 2.3.2 Freeway and Highway Network

The proposed Plan, like adopted MOBILITY 2030, includes operation and maintenance of the region’s highway and arterial network as an important component of the 2030 RTP. Major categories of the proposed improvements for highways and arterials include managed/HOV lane facilities, direct HOV to HOV connections, Highway System Completion, Highway and Arterial Widenings, and new Freeway to Freeway Connections. The highway and regional arterial improvements proposed in the proposed Plan, together with other improvements adopted in 2003 and already constructed, are integrated and coordinated to support and complement the expanded transit system. This includes the managed/HOV lane facilities, some of which support the regional network of transit services. The highway network proposed by the proposed Plan is shown in Figure 2-3 (at the end of Chapter 2.0).
In Table 2-3 below, the freeway and highway system capital improvement projects in the proposed Plan are compared to the matching projects in adopted MOBILITY 2030. The differences in the projects between the adopted and proposed plan are due principally to the difference in projected available revenue; that is, construction and right-of-way costs have increased so dramatically that slightly fewer projects could be built under the Revenue Constrained option.

As shown in Table 2-3, under the proposed Plan, HOV and managed lanes on I-5 south of I-805 have been eliminated. In contrast, the addition of four managed lanes on I-5 would be on a longer stretch of I-5 under the proposed Plan, extending south from SR 56 to La Jolla Village Drive instead of from SR 56 to I-805 under adopted MOBILITY 2030.

### Table 2-3
**Freeway and Highway Projects in the Proposed Plan as Compared to Adopted MOBILITY 2030**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted MOBILITY 2030</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 2 HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>8E + 2 HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>10F + 2 HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805- La Jolla Village Drive</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>14F</td>
<td>14F + 4ML</td>
<td>14F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Leucadia Blvd.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F + 4ML</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Leucadia Blvd.</td>
<td>Vandergrift Blvd.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-8</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F + 2ML (R)</td>
<td>8F + 4ML/MB</td>
<td>8F + 4ML/MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML/MB</td>
<td>8F + 4ML/MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy.</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F + 2ML(R)</td>
<td>6F + 2ML(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54/ SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F/4F+2HOV</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Freeways **SR 241** and **SR 241** are not included in these tables as they do not cross the I-805-56 area.

**Table 2-3 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 28</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94/ SR 125</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F/6E</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 241** Orange County</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>4T/6T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOV Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR-78</td>
<td>East to South &amp; North to West</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>South to West &amp; East to North</td>
<td>South to West &amp; East to North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Highway System Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5/I-805</td>
<td>Port of Entry – Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Inspection Facility</td>
<td>Inspection Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Camino Ruiz</td>
<td>Carmel Country</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Navajo Road</td>
<td>Grossmont</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Jamacha Road</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Highway Widening, Arterials, and Freeway Interchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR-54</td>
<td>J Street</td>
<td>Sea World Dr.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Access Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>10F</td>
<td>14F</td>
<td>14F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St.</td>
<td>Dye Road</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75/</td>
<td>Glorieta Blvd.</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd.</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C + 2TU</td>
<td>6C + 2TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 282***</td>
<td>Melrose Dr.</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Jamacha Road</td>
<td>4F/4C</td>
<td>6F/6C</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Road</td>
<td>Steele Cyn Rd.</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125**</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Telegraph Cyn</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>8T</td>
<td>8T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regionally Significant Arterials and Local Access Freeway Interchanges Retained

## Freeway Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Adopted Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>East to North &amp; South to West</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>West to South &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to South &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- C = Conventional Highway Lanes
- ML = Managed Lanes (HOV & Value Pricing)
- ML(R) = Managed Lanes (Reversible)
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- T = Toll Road
- MB = Movable Barrier
- TU = Tunnel

*Differences between MOBILITY 2030 and 2006 Plan scenarios are in strikeout and shaded; if no strikeout or shading is indicated, information remains unchanged.*

**Privately funded.*

***Funding from federal discretionary defense funding sources.*
Figure 2-1
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Figure 2-3
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C = Conventional Highway
E = Expressway
F = Freeway
HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
MB = Movable Barrier
ML = Managed Lanes
T = Toll Road
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3.0 INITIAL STUDY

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

The following pages contain the Environmental Checklist Form (Form) for the proposed project. The Form is marked with findings as to the environmental effects of the project. A checked box \( \square \) in one of the first four columns indicates the need to prepare additional environmental analysis in the form of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR. If all of the checked boxes fall in the last three columns, preparation of a mitigated negative declaration, a negative declaration, or an EIR addendum will be required.

As explained in Section 1.0, this analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, to provide the factual basis for determining, based on the information available, the form of environmental documentation the project warrants. The basis for each of the findings listed in the attached Form is explained in the text following the checklist (Section 3.2).

Section 3.2 addresses every issue area and every question in the Initial Study checklist. For each issue area, the text starts with a listing of all the mitigation measures from the FEIR for MOBILITY 2030. That is followed by statements regarding mitigation measures, EIR revisions, and new information that are intended to fully address the questions raised in CEQA Sections 15162 and 15163 for considering Subsequent and Supplemental EIRs. These statements are followed by the analysis of checklist questions. This same process is followed for every issue area.
## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES:</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?  

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  

### 2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?  

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

- **a)** Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- **b)** Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- **c)** Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- **d)** Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- **e)** Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- **f)** Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

- **a)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- **b)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES:</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
### ISSUES:

| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | No | No | No | No | X | No |

### 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- Would the project:
  
  a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
  
  b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | No | No | No | No | X | No |
### ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. NOISE – Would the project:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., by extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?  

ii) Police protection?  

iii) Schools?  

iv) Parks?  

v) Other public facilities?  

14. RECREATION – Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES:</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES:</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Substantial Change in Circumstance Requiring Major EIR Revisions</th>
<th>Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR</th>
<th>New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

b) **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**: Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

c) **ADVERSE IMPACTS ON HUMANS**: Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

18. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (Section 15063[c][3][D]).
3.2 DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM RESPONSES

3.2.1 Aesthetics

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR includes measures to which project sponsors of the Systems Development projects shall commit to mitigate potential impacts at the time of certification of environmental documents. These measures include:

- Design projects to minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the project and surrounding natural forms and developments. Avoid, if possible, large cuts and fills when the visual environment (natural or urban) would be substantially disrupted. Site or design projects to minimize their intrusion into important viewsheds and use contour grading to better match surrounding terrain.

- Use natural landscaping to minimize contrasts between the project and surrounding areas. Wherever possible, develop interchanges and transit lines at the grade of the surrounding land to limit view blockage. Contour the edges of major cut and fill slopes to provide a more natural looking finished profile.

- Design landscaping along highway corridors to add significant natural elements and visual interest to soften the hard-edged, linear travel experience that would otherwise occur.

- Replace and renew landscaping to the greatest extent possible along corridors with road widenings, interchange projects, and related improvements. Plan landscaping in new corridors to respect existing natural and man-made features and to complement the dominant landscaping of surrounding areas.

- Construct soundwalls of materials whose color and texture complements the surrounding landscape and development. Use color, texture, and alternating facades to “break up” large facades and provide visual interest.

- Where there is room, landscape the soundwalls with plants that screen the soundwall, preferably with either native vegetation or landscaping that complements the dominant landscaping of surrounding areas.

Even with the implementation of these FEIR mitigation measures, aesthetic impacts from implementation of the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 are potentially significant.
Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to aesthetics.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant aesthetic impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates that there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant aesthetic impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR finds that projects in the Systems Development component of MOBILITY 2030 may result in significant impacts if proposed alignments or facilities require large cut and fill slopes or noise barriers or block views from adjacent areas or intrude into important vistas along roadways (via noise walls or facilities themselves). In addition, proposed rail improvements, such as double-tracking in the coastal corridor, could result in significant visual impacts.

The proposed Plan would not add any projects to MOBILITY 2030, but as indicated in Tables 2-1 and 2-3, would eliminate some projects. A few highway projects would result in more lanes in some segments, but the number of lanes would be reduced in other projects. For the most part, except for projects that would be eliminated, the visual effects of the proposed Plan would be roughly the same and would affect the same scenic vistas as MOBILITY 2030. Compared to the 2000 baseline conditions, the proposed Plan would have significant impacts that would not be fully mitigable, but compared to MOBILITY 2030, visual impacts would be substantially the same.
b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR examined the adopted project’s effects on both designated State scenic highways and State highways eligible for listing. The results are summarized in Table 3-1, in which projects eliminated in the proposed Plan are struck out.

Table 3-1
2030 RTP Projects Relative to Designated or Eligible Scenic Highways as Amended by the Proposed Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Route</th>
<th>Proposed Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 (E)</td>
<td>Additional HOV and general travel lanes, HOV connector, Mid-Coast light rail</td>
<td>Widening freeway (although primarily in median) could increase visual contrast with adjacent open hills/lagoon areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8 (E)</td>
<td>Mission Valley trolley extension</td>
<td>Widening freeway near Los Coches hills would increase scale and urban contrast, although road element already exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 (E)</td>
<td>Additional general travel lanes, additional managed lanes</td>
<td>Widening freeway, primarily in wide median intentionally left undeveloped for anticipated future widening, would increase size and scale of freeway relative to adjacent hills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75 (D and E)</td>
<td>Enhanced transit opportunities via operational improvements</td>
<td>No new construction, N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76 (E)</td>
<td>Additional general travel lanes</td>
<td>Widened freeway could contrast with open space and rural hills adjacent to roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 78 (E)</td>
<td>None in scenic corridor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 79 (E)</td>
<td>None in scenic corridor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94 (E)</td>
<td>Additional general travel lanes, complete freeway connection at SR 125</td>
<td>Widened freeway could contrast with undeveloped slopes adjacent to roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125 (D)</td>
<td>Additional HOV lanes, complete freeway connector at SR 94</td>
<td>Widened freeway could increase size and scale relative to adjacent suburban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 163 (D and E)</td>
<td>Enhanced transit opportunities via operational improvements</td>
<td>No new construction, N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 209 (E)</td>
<td>Operational improvements only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) = Eligible for designation as a Scenic Highway
(D) = Officially designated as a Scenic Highway
N/A = Not applicable
The improvements to I-8 near Los Coches have been eliminated in the proposed plan, so the identified impact in that location would not occur. Otherwise, the impacts of the proposed Plan would be substantially the same as MOBILITY 2030, and substantially the same as MOBILITY 2030 compared to the baseline condition.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response to question 3.2.1a. The FEIR found that for most projects the recommended mitigation would be expected to reduce potentially significant visual impacts to a less than significant level, but that for some projects at particularly sensitive locations, the mitigation measures would not likely reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Due to the elimination of some projects (for instance, the freeway widening at Los Coches cited in Table 3-1), the effects of the proposed Plan would be somewhat reduced, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Highway lighting, including the lighting of signs providing highway information, and vehicle headlights are sources of light and glare that are generally associated with highways and freeways. Other facilities such as transit stations may be lighted at night for safety. Therefore, light and glare from projects in both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan have the potential to affect nighttime views in nearby locations. In many cases where lanes are added to existing facilities, the effect may not be substantial, but both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan include new routes listed under Highway System Completion in Table 2-3. The proposed Plan eliminates some, but not all, of these new routes. The adverse effect would still affect those routes that are retained, so that the effect in those locations would be substantially similar.

3.2.2 Agricultural Resources

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR concludes that there is a potential in some areas for agricultural land to be converted to transportation purposes, and that some of these lands may have been historically used for agriculture and may possess prime soils. To reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level, the FEIR includes the following mitigation measure:

- For projects in agricultural areas, project implementation agencies shall contact the California Department of Conservation and San Diego’s Agricultural Commissioner’s office to identify the location of prime farmlands and lands that support crops considered valuable to the local or regional economy. Impacts to such lands shall be evaluated in project-specific environmental documents. The analysis shall use the land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) analysis method (CEQA Guidelines §21095), as appropriate.
The project implementation agencies or local jurisdiction shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures prior to construction. Mitigation measures may include conservation easements or payment of in-lieu fees.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to agricultural resources.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant agricultural resource impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant agricultural resource impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan have the potential to impact Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and the FEIR concludes the impact could be significant. The exact acreage of impact is not possible to calculate until specific alignments and project features are proposed, but because some projects in MOBILITY 2030 are eliminated in the proposed Plan, the acreage consumed by the proposed Plan is likely to be less. Furthermore, the mitigation in the FEIR would also apply to each plan and would reduce impacts to a level less than significant.
b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* Please refer to the response to question 3.2.2.a, above.

c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* Please refer to the response to question 3.3.2.a above.

3.2.3 Air Quality

**CEQA Determinations**

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** The FEIR concludes that actions and policies considered in the 2030 RTP are intended to reduce congestion and would create a more efficient transportation network. The 2030 RTP would contribute positively to the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the attainment of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS). This in turn would have an overall positive impact on regional air quality and would not result in significant adverse impacts to regional air quality. Since no air quality impact was identified, no mitigation was necessary.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to air resources.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that implementation of the proposed project would not cause new significant air quality impacts. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.
No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant air quality impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The FEIR found MOBILITY 2030 to be beneficial to air quality in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), and to contribute positively to implementation of the SIP by promoting attainment of the RAQS. Calculations of the amount of smog-forming pollutants under each plan show 43.3 tons annually for MOBILITY 2030 and 38.7 tons annually for the proposed Plan. The 2000 baseline is 241 tons annually. Therefore, the proposed Plan would result in greater progress toward the attainment of the RAQS than either the baseline or MOBILITY 2030.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No Impact. The SDAB is a nonattainment area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard and for the state ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM$_{10}$) standards. Ozone is an indicator for smog-forming pollutants and, as stated in the response to question 3.2.3(a) above, would be reduced by the proposed Plan compared to either MOBILITY 2030 or the 2000 baseline. Due to the model used, PM$_{10}$ is difficult to calculate but is expected to be lower for the proposed Plan. Therefore, the proposed Plan is expected to have a slightly greater beneficial effect with respect to air quality standards than either MOBILITY 2030 or the 2000 baseline.

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

No Impact. See the response to question 3.2.3(b), above.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No Impact. The FEIR did not identify any impacts of MOBILITY 2030 on sensitive receptors. More definitive analyses will need to be conducted in environmental documents for subsequent projects. However, the proposed Plan does not propose new projects not included in MOBILITY 2030, nor does it propose new locations for projects. Therefore, it is not expected to result in any impacts that would not be affected by projects in MOBILITY 2030.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact. The FEIR did not identify any impacts of MOBILITY 2030 associated with odors. Some odors could be produced during construction of subsequent projects in the proposed Plan,
such as asphalt odors during paving. Such odors would be localized and temporary and would not be so severe as to significantly affect a substantial number of people. None of the projects proposed in the proposed Plan would be expected to be a long-term source of objectionable odors, and no impacts not associated with MOBILITY 2030 would occur under the proposed Plan.

3.2.4 Biological Resources

**CEQA Determinations**

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** The FEIR found impacts of MOBILITY 2030 on biological resources to be potentially significant but possibly mitigable at the project level. Both direct impacts and indirect impacts from noise, light, glare, air pollution, and polluted runoff associated with new highway and rail projects could adversely affect sensitive habitats, plants, and animals. In particular, such impacts could occur from the I-5 widening and Coastal Rail double-tracking projects. Listed below are general mitigation strategies from the FEIR to be implemented at the project-specific level to reduce impacts from transportation projects. Despite this mitigation requirement, however, the FEIR found impacts on biological resources would potentially remain significant after mitigation.

- Design projects to minimize or eliminate impacts to natural habitats and known sensitive species. Large contiguous areas of habitat shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible to reduce fragmentation of remaining habitat areas. Resource agencies shall be consulted during pre-design stage.

- Provide for continued movement of ground-level wildlife across rights-of-way, where there are designated wildlife corridors through the use of appropriately sized bridges or other openings where roads or transit features would create barriers.

- Provide off-site mitigation contiguous with areas of like resources to maximize the biological value of the habitat provided as mitigation. These efforts shall be coordinated with resource agencies and regional habitat conservation and planning efforts such as the MSCP [Multiple Species Conservation Program] and the MHCP [Multiple Habitat Conservation Program].

- Where possible, avoid impacting oak woodlands, vernal pools, estuaries, lagoons, and other regionally and locally significant biotic resources; where unavoidable, replace with equal or better quality habitat to ensure no net loss of the resource.

- Where possible, avoid alteration of streambeds and associated riparian vegetation; where unavoidable, replace with like quality or better habitat at a ratio required by regulatory agencies with the goal of no net loss to wetlands.

- Preserve open space areas identified in local, state, and federal plans to the greatest extent possible.
• Remove only as much vegetation and disturb only as much wildlife habitat as is absolutely necessary for grading. Revegetate with native plants where appropriate. Staging areas shall be located in previously disturbed areas.

• Schedule construction to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife (e.g., avoid breeding season for sensitive species). Project-specific review shall define specific mitigation measures, such as berms and sound walls, which would reduce construction and operational noise to within regulatory standards.

• Use appropriate water pollution control technology and best management practices to minimize or eliminate impacts to downstream aquatic systems.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to biological resources.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant biological resource impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the Final EIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has examined available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant biological resource impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
According to the FEIR, construction of new highways, road widenings, new HOV lanes, or interchanges for existing facilities may directly impact native habitat and wildlife, including sensitive plant and wildlife species and wetlands, through displacement and loss of habitat. Adverse effects to wildlife may also result from ongoing noise, light, glare, air pollution, and polluted runoff after the facilities are built. In particular, the coastal double-tracking and I-5 improvements along the coastal corridor would impact lagoon systems and certain coastal bluff locations, identified as highly sensitive locations that support sensitive habitats and species. Whether these effects would impact candidate, sensitive, or special status species, and the kind and number of such species is unknown at the programmatic level and in any case would have to be evaluated at the time the project was proposed for implementation. The FEIR addressed this situation by acknowledging that new listings of sensitive species could occur during the lifetime of MOBILITY 2030, and that newly listed species would be addressed at the project level by agencies such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game. The FEIR found that, despite mitigation, the effectiveness of the mitigation to achieve no net loss could not be known, and therefore projects in MOBILITY 2030 had the potential for significant, unmitigated impacts. The same conclusion is applicable to the proposed Plan compared to the No Project condition, including potential effects on newly listed species. Since the proposed Plan eliminates some projects and does not add any new projects or projects in new locations, no new impacts are associated with the proposed Plan compared to MOBILITY 2030.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The proposed Plan eliminates the Sorrento Mesa and Kearny Mesa transitways but retains most of the projects in the coastal corridor. No new projects or new project locations are included in the proposed Plan, so no additional impacts would be expected compared to MOBILITY 2030. The mitigation measures from the FEIR would apply to the proposed Plan, but the same potentially significant impacts would be expected to occur.
c) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* See response to Questions 3.2.4(a) and 3.2.4(b). It is anticipated that all projects affecting federally protected wetlands would be required to obtain permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as required by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Such permits could not be issued without assurance, to the satisfaction of the USACE, that there would be no net loss of federally protected wetlands. Nonetheless, the FEIR concluded that at a programmatic level, there was no full assurance that no net loss would occur, and that such impacts were potentially not mitigated. This conclusion applies equally to the proposed Plan, but since the proposed Plan includes no new projects or projects in new locations, no new impacts compared to MOBILITY 2030 have been identified and such impacts would not be substantially greater than under the proposed Plan.

d) **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native or resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* The FEIR found that highways may present a major impediment to the movement of wildlife across the region. This habitat fragmentation and disruption of movement can substantially impact wildlife populations’ long-term viability in the region. Major new transportation projects such as SR 11 would introduce a new feature where none exists now. SR 905 and SR 125 would be new facilities in relatively undisturbed areas, but both would be constructed without adoption of the 2030 RTP, so the project impact is the incremental widening of each facility. Although impacts to regional open space and wildlife movement would occur through implementation of the 2030 RTP, Natural Community Conservation Program (NCCP) regional planning efforts are designed to mitigate for these losses. In each of the subarea plans within the 2030 RTP study area, the goal is to preserve as much contiguous open space by directing mitigation into a core preserve area, thus maximizing the potential to maintain viable wildlife movement through each subarea. Additionally, each subarea plan contains specific goals and guidelines, such as the incorporation of design features including bridges and large culverts to minimize effects to wildlife movement. Because of such requirements and mitigation included in the FEIR, impacts would be less than significant after mitigation. Since the proposed Plan includes no new projects or projects in new locations, no new impacts compared to MOBILITY 2030 have been identified and such impacts would not be substantially greater than under the proposed Plan.

e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* Specific impacts of projects related to local ordinances and policies cannot be assessed at the programmatic level. However, construction of individual projects will be required to comply
with all such local regulations. Therefore, the proposed Plan will not result in a significant impact nor significantly alter impacts from those evaluated in the certified EIR.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan (HCP), natural community conservation plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. NCCP and HCP plans in the region that would be affected by the 2030 RTP include the MSCP, the MHCP, the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Plan, and least Bell’s vireo HCPs for the Sweetwater, San Diego, and San Luis Rey rivers. Each of these conservation planning efforts is further described in the FEIR. The FEIR found that significant impacts would result if any transportation improvements encroached into any defined comprehensive resource planning area, but it identified no such significant impacts associated with MOBILITY 2030. Since the proposed Plan includes no new projects or projects in new locations, no new impacts compared to MOBILITY 2030 have been identified and such impacts would not be substantially greater than under the proposed Plan.

3.2.5 Cultural Resources

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR includes measures for mitigating the impacts to cultural and paleontological resources that will be required of all projects in the 2030 RTP. The FEIR found that, with implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would not be significant. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, listed below, potential impacts to these resources have been reduced to a less than significant level.

- Where feasible, the project shall implement design measures to avoid archaeological or historical resource areas or areas identified as having significant heritage values to living peoples.
- Preservation of important cultural or scientific sites by capping with fill, asphalt, or some other material to preserve their contextual setting shall be considered.
- Areas of cultural or scientific resources shall be monitored during the grading phase.
- Archaeological and historical resources shall be salvaged through data sample recovery programs.
- All specimens collected shall be archived at an appropriate institution.

The FEIR also recognizes the potential for the discovery of significant paleontological resources during construction of projects in the 2030 RTP and requires the following mitigation to avoid significant impacts:
In general, when a transportation construction project involves known fossil-bearing rocks, qualified researchers are stationed on-site to observe during grading and recover scientifically valuable specimens. A certified paleontologist shall be retained by the project implementing agency prior to construction to establish procedures for surveillance and the pre-construction salvage of exposed resources if fossil-bearing rocks have the potential to be impacted. The monitor shall provide pre-construction coordination with contractors, oversee original cutting in previously undisturbed areas of sensitive formations, halt or redirect construction activities as appropriate to allow recovery of newly discovered fossil remains, and oversee fossil salvage operations and reporting.

The FEIR concludes that with these mitigation requirements, impacts on cultural and paleontological resources would be reduced to a level below significance.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to cultural and paleontological resources.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant cultural or paleontological resources impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant cultural or paleontological resources impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**
Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR found that major new transportation projects could affect significant historic or prehistoric resources, especially new highways such as SR 11 or highway widening in less developed areas. The potential to affect cultural resources is also associated with rail alignments, bikeways, and transit stations or any other ground-disturbing activity from projects in the 2030 RTP. The Federal Highway Administration and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) have responsibilities for the protection of such resources, as explained in the FEIR, and local jurisdictions have responsibilities under CEQA to identify and avoid significant cultural resources. The FEIR found that individual projects under the 2030 RTP would need further evaluation to identify specific impacts, but that the adoption of the mitigation measures would reduce the loss of significant cultural resources to below a level of significance. These same conditions would apply to the proposed Plan. No new information or circumstances would require additional analysis or additional mitigation.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See the response to question 3.2.5(a) above, which pertains equally to historic and archaeological resources.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR identified no unique geological features that would be destroyed by the construction of projects in the 2030 RTP. Additional evaluation of the potential effects on such resources will be conducted in the environmental review for each project. Generally, paleontological resources can only be identified when excavation occurs, since fossils are seldom exposed on the surface due to slopewash and weathering. The paleontological mitigation measure in the FEIR would apply to the proposed Plan and would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Undiscovered human remains would be discovered only after excavation, so the potential for undiscovered human remains cannot be assessed at the programmatic level. If human remains are exposed during construction of projects in the 2030 RTP, California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code § 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who will notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The MLD shall complete his/her inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. These
requirements apply equally to MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan, and would eliminate the potential for significant impacts.

3.2.6 Geology and Soils

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR identifies a number of geologic hazards and conditions that could affect 2030 RTP projects and requires mitigation. For each project, the proponent shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures prior to construction. All projects are required to comply with State of California design standards and standard design, grading, and construction practices to avoid or reduce geologic hazards. The FEIR requires the following:

- Regulatory agencies with oversight on transit and transportation projects have developed engineering design specifications for freeway/highway rail and other transit projects to consider and compensate for site-level geologic and seismic conditions. All site designs shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate agency, such as the Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, and the Federal Transit Administration.

The FEIR found that, with implementation of the mitigation, geologic hazards impacts would not be significant.

In addition, the Water Resources section of the FEIR includes the following mitigation intended to reduce potential impacts from soil erosion:

- To the extent feasible, drainage of roadway runoff shall be designed to run through grass median strips and contoured to provide adequate storage capacity and to provide overland flow, detention, and infiltration before it reaches culverts. Detention basins and ponds, aside from controlling runoff rates, can also remove particulate pollutants through settling.

- Proper erosion control measures shall be implemented during construction and will include measures such as jute netting, straw and chemical mulches, temporary retention ponds, or quick revegetation. Other control measures include limiting the amount of exposed area and preventing construction vehicles and/or equipment from passing through or near natural drainages.

- Long-term sediment control shall include an erosion control and revegetation program designed to allow reestablishment of native vegetation on slopes in undeveloped areas.

- In areas where habitat for fish and other wildlife would be threatened by transportation facility discharge, alternate drainageways shall be sought to protect sensitive fish and wildlife populations. Heavy-duty sweepers, with disposal of collected debris in sanitary
landfills, shall be used to effectively reduce annual pollutant loads. Catch basins and storm drains shall be cleaned and maintained on a regular basis.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to geology and soils.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant geologic impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant geologic or seismic impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

a) *Would the project expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

iv) *Landslides?*

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The FEIR recognizes and describes the major geological hazards and conditions that affect the region, including seismic activity and related hazards and landslides. Both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan include highway, arterial, and transit projects that could be affected by
such hazards. The FEIR found that new transportation facilities could be exposed to both direct and indirect effects of earthquakes, and that potential effects from surface rupture and severe groundshaking could cause catastrophic damage to such facilities.

With regard to seismic activity, the FEIR found that new designs can significantly reduce potential damage. Such design standards, employed on 2030 RTP projects, would reduce the potential for significant impacts. With regard to slope failure and landslides, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be required prior to any transportation facility construction to identify areas of potential failure and recommend remedial measures. The FEIR concluded that with implementation of the geotechnical recommendations related to both seismic exposure and slope failure, required of both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan, impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?**

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* The FEIR finds that 2030 RTP transportation improvements would be vulnerable to soil erosion, especially during construction. Soil erosion could occur from exposed graded surfaces, excavation, stockpiling, and boring. New highways and other facilities would create new impervious surfaces, thus increasing runoff quantities and velocities during rainstorms, and potentially increasing sedimentation.

The FEIR notes that Section 208 of the 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act requires comprehensive areawide planning and management to control nonpoint source pollution. Implementation of the act is the responsibility of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which has delegated much of that authority to state and regional agencies. The EPA and USACE also review and permit proposed discharges or dredging in waters of the U.S., including wetlands, under the Clean Water Act.

In accordance with the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) impose requirements on water pollution discharge; establish ocean, surface water, and groundwater quality objectives based on current or potential beneficial uses; manage the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) in California; and regulate waste discharges. Each regional board is required to adopt a Water Quality Control Plan or Basin Plan. The document for the developed portion of the San Diego region, prepared by Region 9, is the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.*

For the purposes of transportation development, conformance with the Clean Water Act is established through compliance with the requirements of the SWRCB’s 99-08-DWQ (Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity). This permit applies to any project that disturbs more than 1 acre of land. To comply with the permit, the applicant for a construction permit must file a complete and accurate Notice of Intent with the SWRCB. Compliance requires conformance with applicable best management practices (BMPs) and development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), plus development of a monitoring program plan that would prevent construction pollution from contacting stormwater.
The intent is to keep all erosion from moving offsite and into receiving waters. The SWPPP requires an erosion control plan for newly graded areas and permanent facilities for long-term water quality control such as grass swales. Ordinances have been established countywide that require stabilization and revegetation of ground disturbed by grading and require special erosion control measures and monitoring. The requirements often include the preparation of a grading plan that incorporates BMPs for runoff and erosion control such as catchment basins, filtration traps, energy dissipating measures, berms, sandbags, and hay bales. All graded slopes must be stabilized prior to November 15, by means of native vegetation or other suitable means. Grading cannot occur from November 15 through March 31 without prior approval.

Compliance with the RWQCB’s NPDES Permit No. 108758, “Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Urban Runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems Draining the Watersheds of the County of San Diego, the Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and the San Diego Unified Port District,” which was updated in February 2001, requires that all jurisdictions within the San Diego region prepare Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plans (JURMPs). Each JURMP must contain a component addressing construction activities and a component addressing existing development.

In 1999, the SWRCB issued the “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, Statewide Storm Water Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for the State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)” NPDES No. CAS000003. This permit regulates stormwater discharge from Caltrans properties, facilities, and activities.

The FEIR found that the implementation of specific mitigation measures for water quality impacts would reduce potential 2030 RTP impacts to below levels of significance. Since the projects in the proposed Plan are similar to the projects in adopted MOBILITY 2030 in their relation to the issue of soil erosion, the conclusion of the FEIR applies to the proposed Plan.

c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response 3.2.6(a) above. A number of geologic units or soils that are unstable are located in the San Diego region, and some projects in the 2030 RTP will undoubtedly be located where such conditions occur. Site-specific geotechnical investigations for individual projects will identify such conditions and recommend mitigation to reduce the potential for impacts to a level below significance.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See responses 3.2.6(a) and 3.2.6(c). Soil characteristics vary as a result of such factors as parent materials, climate, biota, and topography. There a number of expansive soil types in the San Diego region, and the conditions that would affect many 2030 RTP projects can only be
determined through site-specific investigations. Site-specific geotechnical investigations for individual projects will identify such conditions and recommend mitigation to reduce the potential for impacts to a level below significance.

**e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

*No Impact.* None of the projects in the 2030 RTP would require septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Transit stations may include restrooms but would all be located in areas with municipal sewage collection.

### 3.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

#### CEQA Determinations

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** The FEIR does not include measures for mitigating hazardous materials impacts, which are governed by local, state, and federal regulations.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to hazardous material and wildfire impacts.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant hazardous material or wildfire impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the Final EIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant hazardous material or wildfire impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.
Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. As part of the economic activity of the region, hazardous materials are routinely transported on public roads and highways. Local, state, and federal regulations govern the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances. The routine transport of hazardous materials in California is regulated and enforced by the Highway Patrol, and Caltrans and some local jurisdictions have hazardous materials response programs, teams, and equipment. On a programmatic level, the specific impacts of individual projects associated with use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials cannot be determined, nor can regulations for a program be expected to extend to 2030. However, conformance with regulations intended to assure the safe transport, use, and disposal of any hazardous materials associated with projects in either MOBILITY 2030 or the proposed Plan would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

b) Would the project create a significant harm to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See the preceding response.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. At the programmatic level for a long-range program, specific impacts related to hazardous materials emissions and handling cannot be determined, nor can the proximity of future projects to existing or proposed schools. However, there is nothing to indicate that projects in the 2030 RTP would result in extraordinary use or emissions of hazardous materials. Individual projects will be subject to environmental review at the time of implementation. The result of that review and the application of up-to-date hazardous materials regulations would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

d) Would the project be on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 675962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. At the programmatic level for a long-range program, specific impacts related to hazardous materials sites cannot be determined. Many such sites exist in the San Diego region, and more may be added to hazardous materials sites lists maintained by local, state, and federal agencies over the course of implementation of the 2030 RTP. Individual projects will be subject to site-specific environmental review, which will require identification of hazardous materials sites that could
affect or be affected by the project. That review, and the regulatory governance of hazardous materials sites, would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. There are a number of airports that have land use plans for the surrounding area, and some projects in the 2030 RTP will be in or through such planning areas. In all such cases, individual project environmental review will be expected to identify land use plans and conform to regulation by such plans. If RTP projects conform to the land use provisions of airport comprehensive land use plans, no significant impacts will result.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. There are few private airstrips within the area of projects in the 2030 RTP. Environmental review of subsequent projects in the 2030 RTP will identify any private airstrips in the vicinity and assure that no safety hazard will result from implementation of the project.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Construction of transportation facilities often includes detours, lane closures, and effects on access. Caltrans and local jurisdictions require traffic control plans to be implemented for projects with the potential for such effects, and the traffic control plans must be designed to allow emergency access and response and to coordinate with any emergency response or emergency evacuation plan that affects the project area. If detours are necessary during construction, detour routes must be clearly marked. Completion of projects would not affect emergency response or emergency evacuation plans, and the overall effect of the 2030 RTP would be to improve a number of facilities that could be utilized in such plans.

h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Most transportation facilities are not vulnerable to significant damage by fire. Where structures are proposed in the 2030 RTP, such as transit stations, the locations are generally in urbanized areas and, in conformity with transit-oriented development concepts that are a part of the Land Use component of the RTP, in areas of relatively dense urban development. Each project that includes buildings will be assessed for exposure to wildfire in subsequent environmental review and will be required to conform to building codes and local regulations such as brush management ordinances. No significant impacts result from implementation of the 2030 RTP.
3.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

*CEQA Determinations*

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** Section 4.9 of the FEIR includes measures for mitigating potentially significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality, as follows:

**Surface Water**

- To the extent feasible, drainage of roadway runoff shall be designed to run through grass median strips and contoured to provide adequate storage capacity and to provide overland flow, detention, and infiltration before it reaches culverts. Detention basins and ponds, aside from controlling runoff rates, can also remove particulate pollutants through settling.

- Proper erosion control measures shall be implemented during construction and will include measures such as jute netting, straw and chemical mulches, temporary retention ponds, or quick revegetation. Other control measures include limiting the amount of exposed area and preventing construction vehicles and/or equipment from passing through or near natural drainages.

- Long-term sediment control shall include an erosion control and revegetation program designed to allow reestablishment of native vegetation on slopes in undeveloped areas.

- In areas where habitat for fish and other wildlife would be threatened by transportation facility discharge, alternate drainageways shall be sought to protect sensitive fish and wildlife populations. Heavy-duty sweepers, with disposal of collected debris in sanitary landfills, shall be used to effectively reduce annual pollutant loads. Catch basins and storm drains shall be cleaned and maintained on a regular basis.

**Groundwater**

- Detention basins, infiltration strips, and other features to facilitate groundwater recharge shall be incorporated into the design of new freeway and roadway facilities.

**Flooding**

- Projects shall be designed so that they do not increase downstream flooding risks by substantially increasing peak runoff volumes. This could be achieved by increasing the size of local flood control facilities serving the project areas, increasing bridge spans, or by including detention ponds in designs for roadway medians, parking areas, or other facilities.
• Projects shall be designed to allow lateral transmission of storm water flows across transportation corridors with no increased risk of upstream flooding. Culverts and bridges shall be designed to adequately carry drainage waters through project sites. The bottom of overpass structures shall be elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year flood elevation at all stream and drainage channel crossings.

• All roadbeds for new highway and rail transit facilities shall be elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year base flood elevation.

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the FEIR concluded that potential impacts to hydrology and water quality will be reduced to a less than significant level.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to hydrology and water quality.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant hydrology or water quality impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the Final EIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts to hydrology or water quality are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

a) **Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

**Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Projects in the 2030 RTP will result in development and construction activities that could impact water quality. Runoff from highways and other transportation facilities is known to carry
pollutants and sedimentation. All such projects, however, must conform to water quality regulations, as stated in the FEIR and response 3.2.6(b) above. The FEIR includes mitigation measures that would reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance.

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact. No groundwater consumption due to the project is anticipated. After completion of construction, most of the 2030 RTP projects would result in an increase in impermeable surfaces and a consequent increase in runoff volumes. However, permitting requirements associated with the federal Clean Water Act, SWRCB, and RWQCB regulations would require construction and post-construction control of runoff and a less than significant effect on the quality of groundwater recharge in localized areas (see response 3.2.6(b) above). With the mitigation measures required by the FEIR, impacts of the proposed Plan would be substantially the same as for MOBILITY 2030, which the FEIR found to be less than significant after mitigation.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. According to the FEIR, impacts to both upstream and downstream resources can result from alterations to streams, rivers, and floodways, such as may be caused by construction of bridge pilings in streambeds. The introduction of new or expanded bridge pilings can cause scouring and changes in the transportation and deposition of sediment both upstream and downstream. In turn, this can potentially affect water quality and biological resources that depend on riparian habitat. The FEIR contains mitigation as cited above and concludes that with the recommended mitigation, impacts could be reduced to a less than significant level.

d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Highway bridges and rail crossings of water bodies, including rivers, streams, and lagoons, may alter existing drainage patterns. Planned improvements along or within key highway corridors and rail lines or double-tracking improvements may require fill or alteration of watercourses and lagoons. Proposed bus transit improvements would use existing roadways, so operational improvements to the bus system would have little to no change to water quality. Rail lines do not represent large areas of hardscape but double-tracking along the North County corridor could affect coastal lagoons and other water bodies. However, implementation of specific mitigation measures for water quality impacts would reduce potential 2030 RTP impacts to below levels of significance for either MOBILITY 2030 or the proposed Plan.
e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The requirements of the regulations discussed in response 3.2.6(b) above would prevent the discharge of substantial sources of polluted runoff, and project-level environmental and engineering review would assure that stormwater drainage systems had adequate capacity for new sources of runoff. Since new projects would not be added to the 2030 RTP by the proposed Plan, the conclusion of the FEIR that implementation of specific mitigation measures for water quality impacts would reduce potential 2030 RTP impacts to below levels of significance also applies to the proposed Plan.

f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See responses to question 3.2.8(a-e). Modifications to the ground surface from projects in the 2030 RTP could alter local absorption rates, drainage patterns, and runoff characteristics. Regulatory and mitigation requirements would avoid significant water quality impacts and reduce potential 2030 RTP impacts to below levels of significance. In addition, subsequent projects will be subject to further CEQA review.

g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation?

No Impact  No housing is proposed by the 2030 RTP.

h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Some projects in the 2030 RTP could result in stream and water body crossings and require that structures such as pier walls, columns, abutments, trestles, or approaches be placed within a 100-year floodplain. Mitigation in the FEIR requires that projects shall be designed so that they do not increase downstream flooding risks and allow lateral transmission of stormwater flows across transportation corridors with no increased risk of flooding. Overpass structures must be elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year base flood elevation, and mitigation in the FEIR requires that structures exposed to flood flows do not increase flooding risks. The FEIR found these measures to be adequate to reduce potential impacts to a level less than significant.

i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Engineering standards will ensure that the design of transportation facilities in the 2030 RTP do not increase the risk of failure of levees or dams. Transit stations will be constructed outside of
any area that would be endangered by levee or dam failure. No new facilities are planned within several miles downstream from dams, except the SR 125 between SR 54 and San Miguel Road, which would cross the Sweetwater River below Sweetwater Reservoir. The SR 125 crossing would be on high structure, well above the elevation that would be inundated in the event of a dam failure. Improvements to existing facilities would occur in alignments already established, so there would be no new impacts. While dam or levee failure might result in flooding in some project locations, the risk of significant loss, injury, or death from flooding caused by impoundment structures is likely to be limited and less than significant.

j) Would the project expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The principal risk associated with the projects in the 2030 RTP would be exposure to tsunami in the I-5 and transit rail lines near the coast. Facilities in inland locations would not be located near major water bodies where seiche would be a risk, and engineering standards would reduce the risk of mudslides. Between Del Mar and Oceanside, there would be some exposure to tsunami, at lagoon mouths and other elevations near sea level, below the coastal bluffs. All improvements to rail and I-5 in those locations would be in existing transportation corridors, so the possible exposure to tsunami would not be a new risk associated with the proposed Plan.

3.2.9 Land Use and Planning

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR includes mitigation for the potential of 2030 RTP projects to affect valuable agricultural soils and to convert some open space preserves to transportation uses. Mitigation for the loss of valuable agricultural soils is cited in Section 3.2.2 above, and the FEIR requires mitigation for conversion of open space preserves as follows:

- Project implementation agencies shall identify open space areas that could be preserved and shall include mitigation measures (such as dedication or payment of in-lieu fees) for the loss of open space.

The FEIR found no other significant impacts to land use and planning, and required no other mitigation.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to land use and planning.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant impacts related to land use and planning that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.
No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts related to land use and planning are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR states that a substantial part of the projects in the 2030 RTP would be the expansion of major transportation facilities in a number of jurisdictions in the region. In these areas, possible widening of transportation facilities would not be incompatible with existing or planned adjacent land uses. Land use patterns along these corridors currently reflect the presence of these transportation facilities. Furthermore, the facilities are included in the general plans of affected jurisdictions. The FEIR found no significant impact of the 2030 RTP on established communities. The proposed Plan does not include any projects that were not included in MOBILITY 2030, so no significant impact would occur from its implementation.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The FEIR states that land use in the San Diego region is governed by general plans. Among the elements of general plans are land use, circulation, conservation, and open space. The general plan must be comprehensive and internally consistent. Each element is to have equal status and be consistent with other elements, with consistency between the land use and circulation elements of particular importance. Development of the 2030 RTP has been a coordinated planning effort between SANDAG and affected jurisdictions, including the development of a Regional Comprehensive Plan by SANDAG to provide a unified vision for the San Diego region. Because the RTP was designed in coordination with local jurisdictions and regional transportation and land use planning efforts, the FEIR found the RTP to be compatible.
with local and regional land use plans, policies, and regulations, with no significant impacts associated with such planning.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response 3.2.4(f) above.

3.2.10 Mineral Resources

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR does not identify any significant impacts or contain mitigation measures associated with mineral resources.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to mineral resources.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant impacts related to mineral resources that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts related to mineral resources are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?
Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Transportation facilities proposed in the 2030 RTP are linear projects, such as rail lines and highways, or transit stations that would cover less than 5 acres. Moreover, most of the projects are improvements to facilities that are in established transportation corridors. Valuable mineral resources in the vicinity of the proposed improvements consist, as far as is known, of sand and gravel mining operations. No project in the 2030 RTP would conflict with known materials mining operations, and no impacts on valuable mineral resources were identified in the FEIR.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. Please refer to responses 3.2.9(b) and 3.2.10(a) above.

3.2.11 Noise

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR finds that planned transit, highway, and freeway improvements have the potential to significantly impact the local noise environment if sensitive receptors are located nearby. Each individual improvement would require its own noise study as part of the environmental assessment and review process. To reduce impacts to below a level of significance, the FEIR contains the following mitigation measures, to be implemented by the project proponent or local jurisdiction:

- Alignments of transportation corridors shall consider noise sensitive areas and reduce noise levels by maximizing distance to sensitive receptors (human or wildlife), use of depressed rights-of-way, berms, or sound barrier walls to reduce noise where feasible.

- Land use measures such as zoning designations shall be employed for future development on land adjacent to transportation facilities.

- Where other methods are impractical, operational constraints shall be imposed to the greatest extent feasible (e.g., limits on vehicle speed, regulation of train horns).

- Site-specific and project-specific environmental assessment shall be needed for individual transit projects when they are proposed. Noise impacts may be avoided by careful siting of facilities and the use of noise-reducing berms, walls, or other barriers.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to noise.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new
significant noise impacts that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant noise impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project result in the exposure persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Overall, the noise impacts of the transportation improvements described in the 2030 RTP could be either beneficial or adverse. Implementation of some of the transportation improvements could reduce the number of automobiles traveling on the county’s roadway system, but also could increase the number of trucks, buses, and trains, which generate more noise per vehicle. Furthermore, decreasing congestion, a goal of the 2030 RTP, would allow vehicular traffic on freeways and major arterials to move faster, so that fewer vehicles using a corridor could increase the noise produced by traffic in that corridor. Development of mixed land uses or more intense residential land uses around transit corridors specifically associated with rail lines could expose more people to the higher levels of noise generated by high-volume transit corridors. New developments would need to conform to all applicable noise standards and regulations in their local jurisdiction, and mitigation for new development can be imposed through discretionary approvals. In addition, future land use planning near airport facilities and within airport influence areas should ensure the compatibility of new development with airport operations, and phase out incompatible uses to the extent possible.

Since noise is a highly localized impact, specific and detailed analyses are most appropriate at the project level. Therefore, the method to assess noise impacts in the 2030 RTP was a review of the list of proposed transportation and an assessment of the likelihood of potentially significant noise impacts based on the type of project, location, and general land uses surrounding the
project. The potential noise impacts for street and highway projects in MOBILITY 2030 that are also included in the proposed Plan are listed in Table 3-2. It should be noted that several roadway improvements proposed in MOBILITY 2030 are eliminated in the proposed Plan and are not included in this table. These include improvements to I-5 south of I-805, SR 56, portions of I-8 east of SR 125, etc. (refer to Table 2-2).

### Table 3-2
Potential Noise Impacts of Street and Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Route Improvements</th>
<th>Proposed Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Long-Term Noise Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5, La Jolla Village Drive to Vandergrift Boulevard north to SR 78</td>
<td>Widening to 14 lanes and 4 managed lanes from La Jolla Village Drive to SR 56; to 8 lanes and 4 managed lanes from SR 56 to Vandergrift Boulevard.</td>
<td>Potential increase in noise levels would impact sensitive noise receptors, including recreational users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Managed Lanes</td>
<td>Addition of 2 new managed lanes from SR 163 to SR 56 and 4 new managed lanes from SR 56 to SR 78. Includes new auxiliary lanes at various locations.</td>
<td>New managed lanes would potentially increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors, including residential and recreational users along corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Four new managed lanes from SR 905 in the South Bay to I-5 in Sorrento Valley.</td>
<td>Lane widening and new managed lanes would potentially increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>Planned 4-lane freeway from planned SR 905 interchange to new federal port of entry. Includes truck access route.</td>
<td>New freeway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 East</td>
<td>SR 52 widened as a 4-lane freeway from SR 125 east to SR 67.</td>
<td>Lane widening would potentially increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors, including sensitive habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 South Inner Loop</td>
<td>Proposed 4-lane freeway from SR 125 east to SR 67. Alignment extends primarily within city of Santee.</td>
<td>New highway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Route Improvements</td>
<td>Proposed Improvement</td>
<td>Potential Long-Term Noise Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54 - SR 125 (South Inner Loop)</td>
<td>South inner loop to be developed with 6 lanes and 2 HOV express lanes. Connects SR 94 in Lemon Grove with I-5 in the National City/Chula Vista area.</td>
<td>New highway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Widening from 6 lanes to 8 lanes, plus 2 HOV lanes. Operational improvements planned at various interchanges.</td>
<td>Lane widening would potentially increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125 to Avocado Boulevard widened from 4 to 6 freeway lanes.</td>
<td>Lane widening would potentially increase noise levels at adjacent sensitive receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 241 (Foothill Transportation Corridor South)</td>
<td>Planned Orange County toll road; segment extends within San Diego region, east of I-5. Alignment within Camp Pendleton.</td>
<td>New freeway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905 (Extension to Otay Mesa Port of Entry)</td>
<td>Extension from I-805 to the international border crossing, includes interchange improvements at Siempre Viva Road.</td>
<td>New extension of the freeway and interchanges would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75/SR 282 Coronado Tunnel</td>
<td>Studies underway to potentially create 2-lane tunnel and 6 conventional surface lanes from Alameda Boulevard to Glorietta Boulevard.</td>
<td>Noise would potentially be reduced through high traffic areas of Coronado if traffic was directed through tunnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76 (East)</td>
<td>Upgrade of 2-lane conventional highway from Melrose Drive to I-15 to 4 lanes. Extension connects to I-15.</td>
<td>Lane widening and new extension of the freeway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Arterial Improvements</td>
<td>Widening and gap closure projects will be implemented at key regional arterial facilities. These will be evaluated on a regional basis based on their impact to enhance mobility.</td>
<td>New freeways, connectors, lane expansions, and other regional projects would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Route Improvements</th>
<th>Proposed Improvement</th>
<th>Potential Long-Term Noise Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tollway</td>
<td>SR 125 (south) to be developed as a toll facility between SR 905 and San Miguel Road. Proposed 10.6-mile tollway, 4 lanes with 6 interchanges. Widening to 8 lanes from Telegraph Canyon Road to SR 54; possible HOV/transit lanes beyond 2020.</td>
<td>New highway would potentially increase ambient noise levels and potentially impact nearby sensitive noise receptors along the length of the roadway and near interchanges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential noise impacts for transit projects in the proposed Plan are listed in Table 3-3. As with Table 3-2, those projects eliminated from MOBILITY 2030 are not included. Refer to Table 2-1 for a summary of transit features in the proposed Plan and the similarities and differences from MOBILITY 2030.

Table 3-3
Potential Noise Impacts of Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Potential Noise Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprinter Rail</td>
<td>The Sprinter Rail project is a 24-mile light rail line serving the Highway 78 corridor. Planned to open in 2007, this service will be a single-track system with 15 stations including Oceanside and Escondido Transit Centers, Palomar College, and Cal State San Marcos. The 2030 RTP calls for double-tracking that line, increased service frequencies and an extension from the Escondido Transit Center to North County Fair.</td>
<td>A new rail line would increase ambient noise levels due to train operations and could impact nearby sensitive noise receptors. Double tracking of the Sprinter line would raise noise levels due to increased train service traveling on the rail line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail is an extension of the San Diego Trolley from the Old Town Transit Center, along I-5 to University City.</td>
<td>New trolley line would increase ambient noise at nearby sensitive receptors due to trolley operation including horn noise and crossing gate warnings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Potential Noise Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Double-Tracking</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Double-tracking includes a number of double-tracking and related projects along the coastal rail line between Oceanside and downtown San Diego. These include siding projects, bridge replacements, safety improvements, and passenger enhancements planned to benefit the rail services using the coastal rail corridor (i.e. Coaster, Amtrak, and freight).</td>
<td>Double tracking of the Coastal Rail line would raise noise levels due to increased train service traveling on the rail line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnel at Del Mar</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnel at Del Mar would provide better reliability, safety, and travel time savings to the rail services using the coastal rail corridor.</td>
<td>New tunnel for Coastal Rail service would not increase noise levels but may decrease noise levels because they would be muffled by the tunnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>Other Regional Rail Grade Separations include a number of grade separations along the current Blue Line Trolley, between San Ysidro and downtown San Diego, and the Sprinter rail line. Exact locations are to be determined at a later date.</td>
<td>Grade separations would have the potential to either increase or decrease noise levels. This can only be determined after specific project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers</td>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers are either improvements to existing or the construction of new transit centers for the high-end regional and corridor services proposed in MOBILITY 2030. These include design features like shelters, landscaping, and integration with the local community, advanced systems like real-time information, and pedestrian-friendly features. Additional parking is provided at a number of these stations.</td>
<td>New transit stations could increase noise in the local area due to increased transit vehicle traffic traveling to the new transit station and transit user trips to the transit station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Access Ramps to Managed/ HOV Lanes</td>
<td>Direct access ramps to Managed/ HOV Lanes provide a direct connection for transit from the HOV or managed lanes on the freeway to the transit center.</td>
<td>Direct access ramps could increase ambient noise levels in the immediate area due to traffic on the new ramps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Facilities</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Potential Noise Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles for New Regional Transit Services</td>
<td>Rail vehicles for new regional transit services could include a variety of different vehicles such as light and commuter rail vehicles, articulated bus, standard bus, or flextrolleys (a new generation of vehicles that have the flexibility of a bus with the look and feel of rail).</td>
<td>Increased transit vehicles in operation could increase existing noise along transit routes due to typical noise generated by heavy buses and rail vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial BRT Transit Priority Improvements</td>
<td>Arterial BRT Transit Priority Improvements enable transit to bypass traffic-choked areas on major arterials. These improvements can include signal priority, grade-separated intersections, or queue jumper lanes. Exact locations along a given route are to be determined at a later date.</td>
<td>Improvements that enable transit to bypass traffic would not necessarily increase noise because the improvements would be used by existing transit traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in the two tables above, the FEIR found that planned transit, highway, and freeway improvements have the potential to significantly impact the local noise environment if sensitive receptors are located nearby. Each individual improvement would require its own noise study as part of the environmental assessment and review process.

The FEIR also found that with the recommended mitigation measures at the project-specific level, potential noise impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

b) Would the project expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The FEIR does not identify significant impacts associated with groundborne vibration and therefore no mitigation is recommended. Since the proposed Plan adds no new projects that would cause groundborne vibration to MOBILITY 2030, no new significant impacts are identified for the proposed Plan.

c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response 3.2.11(a) above. Tables 3-2 and 3-3 indicate which projects would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Since these projects are essentially similar in MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan, and since with mitigation recommended in the FEIR the impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance, the proposed Plan would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.
d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Trains can generate high, relatively brief, intermittent noise events. Train noise is an environmental concern for sensitive uses located along rail lines and in the vicinities of switching yards. Construction can be another significant, although typically short-term, source of noise. Construction is most significant when it takes place near sensitive land uses, or occurs at night or in early morning hours. Noise-sensitive land uses can include wildlife habitat.

Local governments typically regulate noise associated with construction equipment and activities through enforcement of noise ordinance standards, implementation of general plan policies, and imposition of conditions of approval for building or grading permits. Construction of the facilities in the 2030 RTP will undergo environmental review, including project-specific noise study as needed, as part of CEQA-mandated environmental review. Mitigation for train noise by land use regulation is included as a mitigation measure in the FEIR and would be the responsibility of the implementing agency or local jurisdiction. The FEIR concluded that noise impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. See response 3.2.7(f) above. Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to be areas where people work, live, recreate, or congregate for relatively extended periods. Transportation projects in the 2030 RTP, with the possible exception of transit stations, include no residences or stationary workplaces. Therefore, no exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of airports would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. See response 3.2.7(g) and the preceding response.

3.2.12 Population and Housing

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR found potential significant impacts associated with displacement of homes and businesses by freeway widening, new highway construction, and increased right-of-way for transit improvements. The following mitigation is recommended:

- Significant adverse impacts resulting from displacement of residents or businesses shall be mitigated with specific relocation measures as dictated by local, state, or federal requirements. Such measures include assistance in finding a new location, assistance with moving, or compensation for losses. Where it has been determined that
displacement is necessary and displaced individuals are eligible, a relocation assistance program consistent with the State Uniform Location Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act provides compensation and assistance in finding new residences for displaced individuals.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to population and housing.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant impacts related to population and housing that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts related to population and housing are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

a) *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

**Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** According to the FEIR, by 2030 the San Diego region’s population is projected to increase by approximately one million persons. The 2030 RTP would facilitate the movement of people and vehicles through an enhanced transportation network and program policies that encourage smart growth strategies. Such land use strategies favor mixed-use, higher density projects near employment centers and along major transportation corridors as opposed to auto-dependent development within outlying areas.
The proposed highway and arterial transportation improvements outlined within the 2030 RTP emphasize a more efficient use of existing roadway network and an enhanced transit network that would facilitate greater mobility between communities and employment or commercial centers within the region. Coupled with the emphasis on smart growth land use principles, these improvements, focused within urban/suburban areas, would facilitate increasing the density of development in selected core areas and decreasing density outside the core areas. This would occur while maintaining a viable transport network, thereby increasing the capacity of existing communities to incorporate population increase as forecasted through 2030.

The potential for significant unanticipated population increases within the region caused by the proposed improvements is minimal, given that proposed improvements would predominantly improve connections between existing communities within the region. Also, the already limited supply of developable land would not be increased as a result of the proposed improvements. The 2030 RTP would not result in unanticipated population increases within the region; therefore, no significant population-related impacts would occur.

The proposed Plan consists of modifications of the projects in MOBILITY 2030, without significant additions. None of the modifications would affect the evaluation in the FEIR. The FEIR’s evaluation is applicable to the proposed Plan as well as MOBILITY 2030.

**b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

*Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.* See response 3.2.12(a). The displacement of homes or businesses is a highly localized impact and requires project-level analysis. Environmental review of subsequent projects in the 2030 RTP will be subject to the mitigation measure in the FEIR regarding displacement, compensation, and relocation. Relocation of residents may utilize existing housing stock or new housing stock. Construction of new housing is regulated by local jurisdictions, but since significant increases in local populations would not result from implementation of the 2030 RTP under either MOBILITY 2030 or the proposed Plan, significant effects with respect to replacement housing would not occur.

**c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

*No Impact.* See responses 3.2.12(a) and 3.2.12(b) above.

**3.2.13 Public Services**

*CEQA Determinations*

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** Public services were not identified as being associated with significant impacts of the 2030 RTP, so no evaluation of public service impacts was included in the FEIR.
Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to the provision of public services.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant impacts to public services that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant public services impacts are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services?
   
i) Fire protection?
   
ii) Police protection?
   
iii) Schools?
   
iv) Parks?
   
v) Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Transportation facilities are included in local and regional land use planning on which the provision of fire and police protection service is based. Since no residential development is proposed in the 2030 RTP, its implementation would not increase the demand for schools and
parks. The 2030 RTP proposes improvements in the regional system of public facilities in the form of street, highway, and transit projects. The proposed Plan, like MOBILITY 2030, is not expected to result in significant impacts.

### 3.2.14 Recreation

**CEQA Determinations**

**Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR.** Public services were not identified as being associated with significant impacts of the 2030 RTP, so no evaluation of public service impacts was included in the FEIR.

**Refined Project Mitigation Measures.** The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to parks and recreation services.

**Major EIR Revisions Not Required.** The following analysis finds no significant impacts to recreation facilities that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

**No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR.** This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

**No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR.** The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts related to parks and recreation are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.

**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

**a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

*No Impact.* The Systems Development component of the 2030 RTP would have no significant effect on population growth or the construction of residential units, and therefore would not
affect the demand for recreation facilities in the region. To the extent that mobility in the region was improved, some increase in access to existing and future recreational facilities may occur.

b) Would the project provide recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. See response 3.2.14(a) above.

3.2.15 Transportation/Traffic

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. The FEIR found that the adoption and implementation of the 2030 RTP with MOBILITY 2030 as its Systems Development component would not result in significant transportation-related impacts, and no mitigation was required.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. For the proposed Plan, the analysis set forth below identifies potential new significant impacts. It is recommended that a Supplemental EIR be prepared to assess these new impacts.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis, in comparing MOBILITY 2030 with the proposed Plan, indicates that there may be new significant transportation impacts caused by adoption of the proposed Plan. Because no new impacts will occur compared to the 2000 baseline condition and because only minor changes in the analysis of traffic/circulation in the FEIR are needed, preparation of a Supplemental EIR is recommended.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances, other than those associated with the proposal of the proposed Plan, which would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. The Land Use component of the proposed Plan uses the Final 2030 Regional Growth Forecast in place of the Preliminary 2030 Regional Growth Forecast used in 2003 for MOBILITY 2030, but use of the newer forecast does make a significant difference in this assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed Plan. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information, other than the proposal of the proposed Plan, indicating that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.
**Analysis of Checklist Questions**

**a) Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

**Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions.** For the proposed Plan, SANDAG analysts subjected the revised plan to comparison with both MOBILITY 2030 and 2000 baseline conditions. The results showed that, due to revenue constraints and the increasing cost of construction, some projects in the Systems Development component needed to be cut back or eliminated, with a consequent reduction in the modeled performance of the completed system. For example, the average trip time per person was projected to increase from 15.1 minutes under MOBILITY 2030 to 17.1 minutes under the proposed Plan. The average automobile work trip speed decreased from 28.3 miles per hour (mph) to 23.1 mph, and the average transit work trip speed decreased from 13.8 mph to 12.9 mph. The percent of daily vehicle miles traveled at Level of Service (LOS) E or F increased from 11 to 15, and the percentage of vehicle miles traveled at LOS E or F during peak traffic periods increased from 20 to 26. Nevertheless, the proposed Plan showed an improvement in the same parameters compared to the 2000 baseline. The deterioration in service indicators when the proposed Plan is compared to the adopted plan requires additional evaluation, and preparation of a Supplemental EIR to evaluate the revised potential traffic impacts is recommended.

With respect to the computer modeling used to generate data for the proposed Plan and the computer modeling used to generate data for the adopted plan, the data are not directly comparable. Since the 2003 RTP was produced, a number of enhancements to the transportation models have been made to streamline operation and improve model accuracy. The models were transferred from TRANPLAN transportation modeling software to TransCAD, which has reduced model execution times and enables more complex modeling procedures to be implemented. For example, a multiple feedback loop trip distribution model better reflects the effects of traffic congestion on travel patterns, a more elaborate toll modeling procedure has improved estimates of HOV/managed lane use, and highway assignment procedures that account for intersection delays have produced more realistic traffic volume forecasts.

In addition to procedural changes, transportation databases have also been improved. For example, GPS-based travel survey is available and was used to modify trip rates in the trip generation model and highway speed assumptions in the highway assignment model. A new on-board transit survey was used to recalibrate the mode choice model parameters to improve transit ridership estimates. Year 2000 U.S. Census population statistics became available and were used in the growth forecasting process to improve trip generation forecasts. Finally, transportation network databases are continually being refined as new information becomes available, such as 2005 digital aerial photography which was used in an extensive review of highway network assumptions.
b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions. For MOBILITY 2030, LOS E or below was used as a measure of significant congestion for roads and highways in the Systems Development component of the 2030 RTP. As stated in the preceding response, daily and peak period vehicle miles traveled at LOS E or F would increase under the proposed Plan compared to MOBILITY 2030. This increase is a substantial change in the project and requires additional evaluation.

c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. See response 3.2.7(e). No change in air traffic levels or locations is proposed or would result from implementation of the proposed Plan.

d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Local jurisdictions, transit authorities, and Caltrans maintain roadway design standards to ensure that increased hazards due to design features do not occur. Projects in the proposed Plan will be subject to these design standards and subsequent evaluation due to project-specific environmental review, thereby ensuring that significant impacts are avoided.

e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. The 2030 RTP would, by improving mobility in the region and developing a circulation network with greater capacity and convenient connections, improve conditions for emergency response as well as for other vehicle traffic, compared to baseline (2000) conditions. For the proposed Plan, there would be a slight worsening of projected travel time and travel speeds compared to MOBILITY 2030. Emergency access to and from locations near the proposed facilities, however, would be provided at all times in conformity to Caltrans and local jurisdictions’ standards. No significant impacts would result.

f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Some projects in the 2030 RTP would require parking (transit stations, for instance) but most would not. Parking is prohibited on freeways and most major highways. Except at some stations, transit facilities do not require public parking. Public parking at transit stations will be maximized, taking into account site-specific factors, to encourage use of transit facilities. Because of these features of the 2030 RTP, there would be no significant effect on parking capacity by implementation of the proposed Plan.
g) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No impact. The 2030 RTP has been designed to promote public transportation, the use of car pool lanes, and alternate means of travel. Together with other components of the 2030 RTP (Systems Management and Demand Management), the RTP is the overarching plan for the region supporting alternative transportation. Since the RTP actively encourages alternate transportation, no impact would result.

3.2.16 Utilities and Service Systems

CEQA Determinations

Mitigation Measures from the Final EIR. Utilities and service systems were not identified as being associated with significant impacts of the 2030 RTP, so no evaluation of utilities and service systems impacts was included in the FEIR. Subsequent environmental review under CEQA of projects in the RTP will require evaluation of potential impacts on utilities and service systems.

Refined Project Mitigation Measures. The analysis set forth below does not identify any new significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no new and/or refined mitigation measures are required for issues related to utilities and service systems.

Major EIR Revisions Not Required. The following analysis compares the proposed project as described in Section 2.3 of this document with the FEIR and indicates that there are no new significant impacts related to utilities and service systems that may be caused by implementation of the proposed project. Major changes to the FEIR are not required.

No Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions. There is no information in the record or otherwise available that indicates there are substantial changes in circumstances that would require major changes to the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than in the Final EIR. This Initial Study has analyzed available relevant information to determine whether there is new information, unavailable at the time the FEIR was certified, that may indicate a new significant effect may occur that was not reported in the FEIR. Based on the following information and analysis, there is no substantial new information that there will be a new, significant impact requiring major revision of the FEIR.

No New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Significant Effects in the Final EIR. The analysis below does not indicate that there are any feasible alternatives to the project or additional mitigation measures that must be considered to substantially reduce one or more of the significant effects identified in the FEIR, since no significant impacts related to utilities and service systems are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project.
Analysis of Checklist Questions

a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Most of the projects in the 2030 RTP will not generate wastewater. Exceptions may be trains and transit stations. Such projects will be evaluated in environmental review at the project level. State and local codes and regulations govern the handling, collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater. In the areas where the RTP projects would be located, wastewater is treated by wastewater treatment facilities permitted, regulated, and monitored by the RWQCB, and pretreatment conditions are required where necessary. Such regulation would avoid significant impacts.

b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Landscaping of some transportation facilities such as freeways, highways, and transit stations may require irrigation, but in general, transportation facilities are not intensive users of water or generators of wastewater. In the San Diego region, the use of recycled water for irrigation is common and increasing. Existing treatment facilities for wastewater and both potable and recycled water are adequate in the region, and future planning will include the relatively small demand generated by existing and planned transportation systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Construction of many of the projects in the 2030 RTP will include the construction of drainage facilities. The impacts of such facilities are highly dependent on location and local conditions and will be evaluated in subsequent project-level environmental review. Potential impacts must be mitigated by the project proponent or local jurisdiction.

d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See responses 3.2.16(a) and 3.2.16(b) above. For a long-range program of individual projects whose principal use of water will be for irrigation, future water supplies cannot be accurately predicted. At the time each project is proposed, environmental review will require evaluation of the possible impacts the project on water supplies. In general, water supplies (potable or recycled) required for the maintenance and operation of transportation facilities are included in the forecasts of future water needs by water suppliers such as municipalities or water districts. On the program level, no significant impacts on water supply would occur.
e) **Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response 3.2.16(a). In general, transportation facility projects of the sort included in the Systems Development component of the 2030 RTP do not require wastewater collection or treatment. In addition, the life span of the RTP exceeds the planning horizon of most wastewater treatment providers, so that the determination of adequate future capacity at this time is premature. At the time each project is proposed, environmental review will require evaluation of the possible impacts of the project on wastewater treatment capacity. On the program level, no significant impacts on water supply would occur.

f) **Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?**

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. Solid waste may be generated during construction of RTP projects, at various points on transit routes, and other sources such as highway litter cleanup. For each project, the construction contractor would be required to furnish evidence of all necessary, permits, licenses, and agreements. The contractor would be responsible for transporting all solid waste generated to an appropriately permitted disposal facility. Disposal of solid waste generated during operation of the facilities would also be in permitted solid waste facilities. The location of such facilities and the adequacy of their capacity cannot be accurately forecast at this time. At the time each project with the potential to generate solid waste is proposed, environmental review will require evaluation of the possible impacts of the project on landfill or other solid waste facility capacity. On the program level, no significant impacts on solid waste disposal capacity would occur.

g) **Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See response 3.2.16(f). Disposal of any solid waste will be by contract with licensed responsible parties. Contracts will require compliance with local, state, and federal statutes and regulations related to solid waste in force at the time the contract is executed, and solid waste disposal is governed by local, state, and federal regulations. No significant impacts would occur.

3.2.17 Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) **POTENTIAL TO DEGRADE:** Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR. See the responses in sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 above. Those sections and the FEIR found that the cultural resource impacts of the 2030 RTP could be mitigated to a level below significance by measures recommended in the FEIR. Significant and unavoidable biological resource impacts are identified for both MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan, but no new significant and unavoidable biological resource impacts that would occur under the proposed Plan but not MOBILITY 2030. All mitigation measures required of MOBILITY 2030 would also be required of the proposed Plan.

b) CUMULATIVE IMPACTS: Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when reviewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future project.)

Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions. The FEIR found impacts associated with land use, noise, water resources, biological resources, and visual resources to be cumulatively considerable. For land use, the conversion of open space and more rural uses to transportation facilities, combined with ongoing losses of regional open space and agricultural land as other development occurs, would be cumulatively considerable. Continued development of the region as the 2030 RTP was implemented would lead to a generalized, cumulatively considerable increase in noise affecting particular areas. While much of the development proposed in the 2030 RTP is targeted toward already urbanized areas and away from rural lands, some improvements would impact sensitive habitat and undeveloped open space, especially in the southern portion of the region. The cumulative loss of these habitats from the proposed and all other cumulative projects would be considered a cumulatively significant impact. Mitigation measures such as landscaping and contour grading would reduce the visual contrast, but the visual changes associated with all regional projects in the area would create a significant and unmitigated cumulative impact to visual quality as the region continues to grow. Between the adoption of MOBILITY 2030 and the proposal of the proposed Plan, no circumstances regarding the sensitivity of the resources or the features of the RTP have significantly changed, other than the differences in projects in the Systems Development components described in this Initial Study. Therefore, the FEIR’s assessment of cumulative impacts of the 2030 RTP are still relevant for the proposed Plan, with the possible addition of the cumulative impacts related to transportation/circulation (see Section 3.2.15). For transportation/circulation, subsequent analysis is needed to assess the potential for cumulative impacts related to differences between MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan.

c) ADVERSE IMPACTS ON HUMANS: Does the project have environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions. See all other checklist responses. The FEIR prescribes a number of mitigation measures, most of which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level for adopted MOBILITY 2030 and the proposed Plan. Impacts on visual resources and biological resources remain significant and adverse for the proposed Plan even with the implementation of the relevant mitigation measures in the FEIR. In addition, as
discussed in section 3.2.15 above, the proposed Plan has the potential to result in significant impacts to traffic/circulation. The significant impacts occur with respect to the proposed Plan compared to MOBILITY 2030, and not compared to the 2000 baseline. To make traffic/circulation analysis in the EIR adequate for the proposed Plan, only minor changes in performance indicators are required. As a result of this Initial Study, it is recommended that a Supplemental EIR be prepared to assess the impacts of the proposed Plan related to traffic/circulation.

3.2.18 Earlier Analyses

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D).)
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During the public review period, four letters of comment on the SEIR were received. Those letters were from:

- Robert J. Hoffman
- Catherine Engberg of Shute, Mihaley & Weinberger, LLP
- Alex Alagha of the City of Chula Vista Department of Engineering
- Angela Shafel Payne of the San Diego Regional Airport Authority

The letters and responses to the comments that address the adequacy of the SEIR are reproduced in the following pages.
Letter from Robert J. Hoffman

January 10, 2006
5041 Guave Avenue, Apt. 320
La Mesa, CA 91941-3054
(619) 588-0204
rhoff@melbhera.com

SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Folks,

This is a response to the public review for Draft 2030 Revenue Constrained Plan and the 2006 Update and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. But before those documents can be properly analyzed, item 5 in the December 9th Transportation Committee Agenda must be reviewed. The character of that item reflects on all in the subsequent reports.

Item 5 reports on a hearing for Unmet Transit Needs. While there were four meetings at various places throughout the county, only 23 responses were obtained. All were rejected for one reason or another. Clearly this was an action to fill the needs of the agency, not the consumer. And this is the flaw in all government operations. Even more suspect is that only 23 responses were reported while 600 riders per day are commonly reported on many lines.

Any successful businesses will tell you that their operation must respond to the customer's desires, not the owners. Yet consistently government takes the opposite stance. They are the masters, not the servers. Thus service is little used and avoided except for those who have no other choice.

Turning now to the current review of "Supplemental Environmental Impact Report", items bearing further review are:

1. Frontispiece: There is no recognition of customer desires in the list of "potentially significant impacts" in the second paragraph.

2. Page 2: "Spacing stations farther apart" is counter to the customer's desires

3. Page 2: "New stations would be integrated into central activity areas that include pedestrian and bicycle-friendly components". This is too trivial to have a noticeable effect on transit volume.

4. Page 2: "Trains on time" is nothing more than a play with words. How will the customer perceive any noticeable difference?

5. Page 4: Signal priority and queue jumpers are tactics that will rile the drivers. It is politically charged.

Comment noted.

Regional and corridor services connect the major trip pairs. Local bus service provides frequent stop service. Both types of services can be used in the same corridor to serve different trips and passenger markets.

This relates to the smart growth strategy called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan, in which transit is located in community and neighborhood centers where people want to go. These areas are designed for the pedestrian and are appropriate walk and wait environments for transit.

There are distinct differences between bus and rail service. The point of this is to say that BRT and other new regional bus services will have a premium quality ride.

Transit priority measures are used both nationally and internationally to enhance transit service and therefore increase use. In Los Angeles, signal priority has been used for several years and in San Diego in particular, there are a number of queue jumpers in operation.
The following comments do not address the adequacy of the SEIR.

Trip Generation

Page 90: "In each zone are estimated. This just a guessing game. There is no way to obtain substantive numbers.

Page 90: "The trip generation model works by applying trip rates to zone-level growth forecasts. More guessing games?"
Page 90: "Trip generation rates were established by... traffic generator studies and expounding (or elaborating) rates from the 1995 Travel Behavior Survey and 2001 Caltrans Statewide Travel Survey."
Fortuneteller input? Inserted word is italicized.

Page 90: "The model accounts for travel diversion among facilities." Now this is pure guesswork.

Page 90: "The model reduces future year person trips by a small amount to reflect increased use of tele-working and e-commerce." 3 to 6%. Guesses too small to be worth the effort.


Page 90: "generation forecasts by trip type, zone-to-zone impedances, and gamma-function parameters" More buzzwords.

Mode choice

Page 91: "Vehicle trips on a congested route would be more likely to be diverted to light rail than vehicle trips on an uncongested freeway." Depends on the portals.

Page 91: "The mode choice is calibrated (wrong word) using 1965 and 2001 Travel Behavior Survey trip tables by mode and income, and 2001-2003 Regional Transit Survey trip characteristics. Regional-level Census 2000 work trip mode shares were also used to fine-tune mode share estimates." What about randomness?

Highway and Transit Assignment

Page 92: "onboard transit rider surveys" Why bother with the elaborate models on prior pages if surveys are performed?

Post-TransCAD Processing

These items appear to be a mixing of categories of doubtful meaning. The buzzwords obscure any meaning.

These machinations reveal the analysts lack any real world experience in retail sales which is what transit is. All the assumptions, extrapolations, and evaluations fail the crucial test of what the customer desires. These
machinations are an exercise in bureaucratic fantasies which perceive their
creations as more important than the user.

Today's technology and business methods can produce a service which
recognizes today's market. For example, it must be something that can compete
with the paramount transportation means: the private automobile. Typically,
door-to-door transportation is demanded. No transfers. Instantaneous response.
At least eighteen market features are possible while current transit lacks any. It's
time transit aficionados entered the real world of 2006!

Sincerely,

Robert J. Hoffman

Robert J. Hoffman
SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
296 HAYES STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102
TELEPHONE: (415) 982-7370
FACSIMILE: (415) 982-9516
WWW.SMHLLP.COM

January 25, 2006

VI A FEDERAL EXPRESS
Rob Rundle, Principal Regional Planner
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update

Dear Mr. Rundle:

We submit this letter on behalf of Save Our Forest and Ranchlands ("SOFAR"), an organization dedicated to the protection of the wilderness, watershed, and agricultural resources of San Diego County. As you know, SOFAR has been closely involved in SANDAG’s regional transportation planning and, in July 2003, executed a settlement agreement with SANDAG in connection with the adopted Mobility 2030 Regional Transportation Plan ("Adopted RTP"). As part of this settlement, SANDAG is developing a more transit-oriented "SOFAR Alternative" that will be incorporated as part of the 2007 RTP update. SOFAR commends SANDAG for its work thus far on the development of the SOFAR Alternative and looks forward to working with SANDAG on this Alternative prior to the 2007 RTP update.

We have reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("SEIR") for the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update ("2006 Revenue Constrained Plan" or "Project") and concur with the SEIR’s general conclusion that the 2006 Revenue Constrained Plan, which includes fewer highway improvements, will be environmentally superior to the Adopted RTP with respect to biological resources, agricultural lands, hydrology, and other impact areas. However, we remain concerned

The SEIR analyzes the impacts of comparing one program (MOBILITY 2030) to the Revenue Constrained program (2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update). While SANDAG did perform detailed traffic analysis with the TransCAD transportation model to analyze the performance of the transportation network, SANDAG does not have detailed facility alignments and footprints to quantitatively assess direct impacts from specific project implementation. The original FEIR for MOBILITY 2030 does state project-specific analysis for implementation of future transportation projects will be required. Similarly, the SANDAG Board adopted an Addendum to the Final EIR (March 2003) that in part states, “The Plan analyzed in the Final EIR covers the San Diego County region covered by SANDAG’s 18 member city boundaries (Final EIR, p. 1-1). At future stages in planning and implementation of the specific transportation projects identified in the Plan (‘projects’), there will be separate, project-specific CEQA and/or NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) evaluation prepared by the project sponsor to 1-3; 4.0-1). The unique environmental aspects of each project, coupled with the unique environmental issues facing the San Diego region, will require separate environmental review of each project without reliance on the Final EIR. This conclusion does not invalidate the Plan as a general model and guideline for transportation improvements and growth.”
that the original EIR lacks sufficient detail from which to compare the impacts of the
Project to those of the Adopted RTP.

Both the RTP EIR and SEIR conclude that neither plan would result in any
significant traffic impacts. This conclusion ignores potential significant traffic impacts at
individual intersections and roadway segments and dodges the opportunity to consider
mitigation and alternatives that could minimize transportation impacts. Indeed, in a
recent SANDAG study, SANDAG found that San Diego County residents’ number one
concern is highway congestion and, as a result, 57 percent of residents are considering
moving from the region in order to improve their quality of life. See SANDAG, San
Diego Region Public Opinion Survey (July 2005). On a positive note, the study also
found that about half of residents favor “smart growth” development that locates housing
close to transportation centers.

A further refined SOFAR Alternative could address these transportation
impacts by providing more transit where “smart growth” is occurring, such as in the
downtown. SOFAR invites SANDAG to discuss possible refinements to the SOFAR
Alternative that would involve transferring transportation dollars from regional highway
projects to downtown-oriented transit. SOFAR remains committed to the philosophy that
the best way to address transportation impacts is to get people out of their cars and into
buses, trolleys and shuttles.

Very truly yours,
SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER, LLP

CATHARINE ENGBERG

cc: Duncan McFetridge, Save Our Forest and Ranchlands

The analysis presented in the RTP EIR and SEIR is based on
programmatic level analysis and does acknowledge that localized
impacts could result from individual projects. The MOBILITY 2030
EIR states that, “it is possible that individual transportation
improvements included in the 2030 RTP would have traffic and
transportation impacts on local streets and transportation systems.
The detailed environmental analysis to be conducted at the project-
specific level is the appropriate process for the analysis and
mitigation of any identified transportation impacts.”
Letter from City of Chula Vista

January 30, 2006
File #0140-20-LY 122

SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Attention: Heather Werduck, Senior Planner

COMMENTS ON 2030 REVENUE CONSTRAINED RTP AND SEIR

We have received and reviewed the 2006 draft update to the 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as well as the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. The following are our comments.

On an overall basis, we would like to question why SANDAG is currently proposing to allocate the entire TransNet revenues solely within the Revenue Constrained Scenario of the RTP. It was our understanding that passage of the TransNet extension would allow the region to utilize the recommendations of the Reasonably Expected Scenario. The widening of two HOV lanes along I-5 between downtown San Diego and Chula Vista, which was promised as part of TransNet passage, is not included in the subject 2006 update. If the update is adopted in its current form, it will become increasingly more difficult for the South Bay Region to secure timely funding for much needed highway congestion relief. As such, the EIR is inadequate for it does not analyze the impacts of removing TransNet revenues from the Reasonably Expected scenario and allocating the entire amount to the Revenue Constrained Scenario.

Congestion relief in the South Bay should be incorporated into the proposed plan to allow the region to initiate the long and arduous process of freeways’ widening. SANDAG funding assumptions should be revised to allow such a process to commence.

In order to ensure adequate and timely traffic congestion relief in the South Bay, we recommend the following specific modifications to your proposed projects, which are mentioned in Tables 4.2 and 4.5 of the RTP and Tables 2-2 and 2-3 of the SEIR:

1. Identify grade separation structures and related station improvements along the Blue Line Trolley in South County as separate and unique projects with construction time frames between 5 and 10 years. Funding should be allocated from the Transit Capital expenditure plan. SANDAG has previously committed to construct two bridges on E Street and 2nd Street along with the planned service upgrade for the trolley in South County. The Chula Vista staff recommendation is a minor modification that would allow these two bridges to be constructed as separate projects before the planned service upgrade.

The following comments do not address the adequacy of the SEIR.

8. The 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP: 2006 Update is based on a revenue constrained funding scenario that does include the TransNet percent sales tax extension. While MOBILITY 2030 assumed the passage of the TransNet extension in the reasonably expected funding scenario, since that time the TransNet extension was passed by the voters and was therefore included in the revenue constrained scenario.
2. Extend the limits of the "Access Improvement" project on I-5 south of its planned terminus at SR-54 to the J Street interchange to reduce current and future traffic congestion in the South County. The current funding plan already contains freeway improvements on I-5 to enhance access to this vital corridor. However, these improvements are limited to the area between downtown San Diego and SR-54. Chula Vista position is that the freeway congestion ends at SR-54 and that it would be prudent to extend the subject freeway improvements southerly to J Street.

We hope that these comments will be incorporated into this version of the Regional Transportation Plan. Please contact me at (619) 691-5028 regarding any updates on this plan or the EIR.

Alex Alagha
Director of Engineering
January 27, 2006

Mr. Ro Russell
Principal Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101


Dear Mr. Russell:

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCAA) is currently undertaking an Airport Site Selection Program for the entire San Diego region and also preparing the San Diego International Airport Master Plan. Three programs will address the short- and long-term development of San Diego International Airport (SDIA).

As an integral part of this development, the SDCAA has extensively coordinated with SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD to address local and regional transportation issues related to the metropolitan San Diego area and SDIA. Your agency’s participation on the Airport Transit/Roadway Plan Technical Committee has yielded significant contributions towards addressing the transportation needs of the San Diego metropolitan area.

In an effort to continue this coordination, we appreciate the opportunity to review and submit comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the 2000 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan: 2000 Update.

The following are our comments to this Plan:

- In 2004 and 2005, SDIA has experienced 6-7% annual growth in passengers resulting in 17.4 million annual passengers in 2005. SDIA is the third busiest airport in California for passenger growth behind LAX and SFO. In addition, SDIA is primarily an “origin and destination” airport with over 95% of the 17.4 million annual passengers either beginning or ending their airport trips in the San Diego region (as opposed to “connecting” passengers). With this volume of passengers and over 2,000 airport employees, there needs to be additional and more frequent transit connections to the airport, including the expansion of the Route 992 Flyer and potential rapid bus/Transit First service between the Old Town Transit Center which provides intermodal connectivity to the Trolley and...
Coaster for airport users. Please include additional and more frequent transit connections to the airport in the MOBILITY 2030 plan.

- Revise the Regional Transportation System and Transit Projects (Section 2.3.1) to include expanded transit route service to SDA, considering trolley service between the Old Town Transit Center and the airport. The SDCRAA will gladly provide airport user data (e.g., passenger and airport employee estimates) and the results of an updated airport travel demand analysis to assist in developing transit route service information, including transit ridership characteristics and frequency of service.

We welcome the opportunity to comment on any future transportation or transit plans that your agency will prepare and we look forward to your continued participation on the Airport Transit/Roadway Plan Technical Committee. Please contact Brett Caldwell at (619) 400-2482 or Ted Ansia at (619) 400-2478 if you have any questions regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Angela Shaw, PPA
Vice President, Strategic Planning

cc: Ted Ansia, SDCRAA, Manager, Airport Planning
    Brett K. Caldwell, SDCRAA, Airport Planner II
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