BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA

Friday, May 9, 2014
10 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• APPROVAL OF AWARD TO CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT AND LOSSAN RAIL CORRIDOR PROJECTS

• MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT SANDAG.ORG

MESSAGE FROM THE CLERK
In compliance with Government Code §54952.3, the Clerk hereby announces that the compensation for legislative body members attending the following simultaneous or serial meetings is: Executive Committee (EC) $100, Board of Directors (BOD) $150, and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) $100. Compensation rates for the EC and BOD are set pursuant to the SANDAG Bylaws and the compensation rate for the RTC is set pursuant to state law.

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Public comments regarding the agenda can be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the agenda item, your name, and your organization. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Board of Directors meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list at either the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

**SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.**

![Map of SANDAG offices](image)
1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Public comments under this agenda item will be limited to five public speakers. Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Other public comments will be heard during the items under the heading “Reports.” Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (2 through 3)

+2. APPROVAL OF AWARD TO CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT AND LOSSAN RAIL CORRIDOR PROJECTS (John Haggerty and Greg Rodriguez)*

The Board of Directors is asked to approve the selection of Mid-Coast Transit Constructors as the Construction Manager/General Contractor for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the Elvira to Morena Double Track Project, and the San Diego River Bridge Double Track Project, and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Pre-Construction Services contracts for the project, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the Elvira to Morena Double Track Project, and the San Diego River Bridge Double Track Project.

+3. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE (John Haggerty)*

This item provides a general update on the Mid-Coast Project, including the ongoing environmental review process, planned application for federal funding, and progress of project design. This update also discusses the recent discovery of San Diego Fairy Shrimp within the project footprint and recent community concerns related to the Interstate 5 (I-5) crossing south of Nobel Drive. Staff also will provide an update on the schedule and process for approval of the final environmental documents and obtaining a Full Funding Grant Agreement from the Federal Transit Administration. The Board of Directors may take action on potential modifications to the Refined Build Alternative related to the I-5 crossing for inclusion in the final environmental documents.

4. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

If the five speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

5. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 23, 2014, at 9 a.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
APPROVAL OF AWARD TO
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR
FOR MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT AND
LOSSAN RAIL CORRIDOR PROJECTS

Introduction

Pursuant to direction from the SANDAG Board of Directors in April and June 2013, and in accordance with the Request for Proposals (RFP) issued on October 17, 2013, final approval of the selection of a Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) for the construction of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, and two Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor projects – the Elvira to Morena Double Track Project and the San Diego River Bridge Double Track Project – is being requested by the Board (collectively, Projects).

Discussion

Procurement Information

SANDAG conducted a best-value procurement consistent with Board Policy No. 24: Procurement and Contracting - Construction, and Public Contract Code §6950, which grant SANDAG the authority to make use of the CM/GC contracting method following certain findings made by the Board. The Board made the necessary findings and approved use of the CM/GC contracting method for the Mid-Coast Transit Corridor Project on April 26, 2013, and the two LOSSAN Double Track Projects on June 28, 2013. The RFP sought proposals for the selection of a CM/GC to construct the Projects.

On June 28, 2013, the Board approved the evaluation process and criteria for selecting a CM/GC. The scoring of proposals had three elements: (1) Technical Evaluation (150 points maximum); (2) Interview (50 points maximum); and (3) Price (50 points maximum).

Four proposals were received and evaluated in response to the RFP. All proposers are joint-venture firms as follows (in no particular order):

- Kiewit/Sundt, a joint venture of Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. and Sundt Construction Inc.
• Mid Coast Transit Constructors, a joint venture of Stacy & Witbeck, Inc., Skanska USA, and Herzog Contracting Corporation

• San Diego Transit Constructors, a joint venture of Flatiron West, Inc., URS Energy & Construction Inc., and Granite Construction Company

• WCAR, a joint venture of Walsh Construction Company, Clark Construction Group, Atkinson Constructors, LP, and Railworks Projects, Inc.

**Evaluation Process**

The proposals were evaluated by SANDAG for responsiveness and scored by an evaluation committee consisting of nine members from SANDAG, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, UC San Diego, City of San Diego, and Caltrans.

The final scores of the Technical Evaluation for the proposals (which was based on the written technical proposals submitted by the proposers), had average technical scores within a ten-point range. Based on the closeness of the average technical scores and the quality of the proposals, the Evaluation Committee recommended that all Proposers be shortlisted and interviewed. In February, the Transportation Committee recommended and the Board approved interviewing all four proposers. The Evaluation Committee held interviews over two days, March 17 and March 19.

Upon completion of the interviews and final scoring of the interviews by the Evaluation Committee, the scoring of the Price component was completed. The scoring on the Price is based on the CM/GC Multiplier submitted by a proposer. The CM/GC Multiplier represents a fixed percentage fee of the profit and home office overhead for the CM/GC on the Projects. All proposers submitted the same CM/GC Multiplier, except for one proposer who submitted the highest CM/GC Multiplier, and thus scored the lowest on the Price component.

As provided in the RFP, the combined scores (Technical Evaluation + Interview + Price) of each Evaluation Committee member were used to assign a rank (1, 2, 3 or 4) to each proposer. Following the assignment of ranks, final rankings were tallied, and it was determined that two proposers had identical final rankings of “1.” These two proposers were Mid Coast Transit Constructors and Kiewit/Sundt. In the event two proposers have identical final rankings, the RFP provides that the first tiebreaker will be the Proposer with the highest score on the Price. Here, both Mid Coast Transit Constructors and Kiewit/Sundt had identical scoring on Price since both proposed the same CM/GC Multiplier.

The second tiebreaker under the RFP is the proposer with the highest combined scores from the Technical Evaluation of “Team Experience” and “Construction Phase.” In order to determine the scores for the second tiebreaker, the scores of the nine Evaluation Committee members for Team Experience (20 points maximum) and Construction Phase (30 points maximum) were added up and resulted in the following:

1) Mid Coast Transit Constructors: Team Experience (149.75) + Construction Phase (241.25) = 391.00 points

2) Kiewit/Sundt: Team Experience (135.00) + Construction Phase (229.50) = 364.50 points
As a result of the second tiebreaker, Mid Coast Transit Constructors scored 26.50 more points than Kiewit/Sundt after combining the technical scoring on “Team Experience” and “Construction Phase” by all nine Evaluation Committee members. Accordingly, Mid Coast Transit Constructors was ranked “1” and Kiewit/Sundt ranked “2” based on the results of the second tiebreaker.

In accordance with the RFP, the rankings and results of the first and second tiebreakers were presented to SANDAG executive management for review. Additionally, the Evaluation Committee has presented its recommendation to executive management for the selection of Mid Coast Transit Constructors for approval by the Board as a result of the final rankings resulting from the evaluation process provided for in the RFP, including the tiebreakers.

Finally, SANDAG has completed a thorough financial analysis of Mid Coast Transit Constructors to ensure compliance with Board Policy No. 24, as applicable to the procurement, and the specific financial requirements provided for in the RFP. A determination was made that Mid Coast Transit Constructors has met all financial requirements.

**Proposed Contract Details and Next Steps**

Following Board approval of the selection of a CM/GC contractor and expiration of the protest period (or resolution of any protests), SANDAG staff will work to negotiate, finalize, and execute Pre-Construction Services Agreements for the Projects. The proposed scope of work for the Pre-Construction Services for each project includes assistance with project design and constructability review, assistance with development of construction plans and project specifications, and assistance with the development of a construction phasing plan. The total estimated costs of such contracts are not expected to exceed $10 million, and the Pre-Construction Services phase is expected to last approximately 18 months.

At the point when the design for the Projects is closer to completion, and upon a determination that the selected CM/GC has successfully performed the Pre-Construction Services to date, SANDAG and the CM/GC will enter into negotiations to finalize the Construction Services Contracts, including negotiation of a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the completion of the Construction Services for each project. If SANDAG and the CM/GC are able to agree upon a scope of services and the GMP for the Construction Services for a project, the parties will enter into a Construction Services Contract. Otherwise, if negotiations are not successful for a project, SANDAG may separately procure the Construction Services. All Construction Services Contracts will be presented to the Board for approval before the start of any Construction Services.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contacts: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, john.haggerty@sandag.org
Greg Rodriguez, (619) 699-1963, gregory.rodriguez@sandag.org
Introduction

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project (Mid-Coast Project) is a TransNet Early Action Program Project that will extend the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Blue Line Trolley from the Santa Fe Depot in downtown San Diego to University Towne Centre through the UC San Diego campus.

The Mid-Coast Project Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIS) is in final processing for approval by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the SANDAG Board of Directors (Board). The Final SEIS/SEIR is based on the Refined Build Alternative approved by the Board in November 2013. In addition to providing a general update on the Mid-Coast Project, including the ongoing environmental approval process, planned application for federal funding, and progress of project design, this report discusses the recent discovery of San Diego Fairy Shrimp within the project footprint and recent community concerns related to the Interstate 5 (I-5) crossing south of Nobel Drive and how such items potentially affect the schedule and process for completion of the Final SEIS/SEIR and obtaining a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) from the FTA.

Discussion

On November 15, 2013, the Board approved the Refined Build Alternative as the project to be evaluated in the Final SEIS/SEIR after considering a summary of the comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR during the public comment period and public comments provided at the November 15 meeting. A response to each comment submission received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR during the public comment period also was prepared and is included in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The Administrative Draft of the Final SEIS/SEIR is currently under review by the FTA, the federal lead agency for the SEIS and Mid-Coast Project.

The Refined Build Alternative generally reflects the Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR with the following changes, which were developed in response to comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR, community outreach meetings, additional analysis of impacts identified in the
Draft SEIS/SEIR, and coordination with other public agencies and stakeholders located along the alignment presented in the Draft SEIS/SEIR:

- Addition of the Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center Station Option based on ridership, improved access to hospital and medical facilities, and favorable public comment
- Elimination of the Genesee Avenue straddle bent design option to reduce visual impacts and address adverse public comments
- Realignment of the viaduct from the north side of Voigt Drive to the south side near Scripps Memorial Hospital to reduce impacts to hospital operations
- Elimination of the straddle bents from the I-5 crossing south of Nobel Drive to reduce visual impacts and shifting the crossing an additional 360 feet further to the south to address visual concerns raised
- Modifications to parking at the Clairemont and Nobel Drive stations as a result of refined design
- Revisions to traction power substation locations as a result of refined power flow analysis
- Revisions to construction staging area locations in response to comments and avoid impacts to approved developments

There are several requirements that must be met in order for projects such as Mid-Coast to receive funding through the federal New Starts Program. This federal program, which provides funding for major public transit projects nationwide, is highly competitive, with anywhere between 15 and 25 projects in the funding “pipeline” in a given year. The New Starts Program also is highly structured and process oriented, requiring intermediate approvals by the FTA throughout the development of a project.

The San Diego region has worked diligently during the past several years to advance the Mid-Coast Project through the New Starts process. This important project was included in the original TransNet measure passed in 1987 as well as in the TransNet Extension approved by more than two-thirds of voters in 2004. Steady progress has been made with the goal of getting into the FY 2016 federal funding cycle and receiving a New Starts funding commitment from FTA in fall 2015. Based on discussions with FTA staff and SANDAG consultants experienced with securing FFGAs for large public transit projects, hitting this particular funding cycle is important for several reasons.

First, several of FTA’s existing FFGA commitments are expected to be fulfilled in FY 2016, providing funding capacity for new FFGAs like Mid-Coast. Second, staff anticipates working with existing FTA headquarters and regional staff if the project can maintain its current schedule; a one-year delay to the FY 2017 federal funding cycle introduces uncertainty as the election of a new President in 2016 would bring in a new Administration and likely changes to key FTA participants. In addition, schedule delays also may introduce an escalation in costs, including construction costs.
Current Schedule – Environmental Review and Application for Federal Funding

Key dates under the current anticipated schedule include:

- June: FTA publication of a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register
- July: SANDAG Board approval of the Final SEIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- September: FTA issuance of its final environmental approval, known as a Record of Decision (ROD)
- Fall 2014: Submittal of New Starts application to FTA
- Fall 2014/winter 2015: FTA includes Mid-Coast Project in its Annual Report on New Starts
- February 2015: Recommendation to receive an FFGA¹
- Fall 2015: Receipt of FFGA

However, based on recent developments, this anticipated schedule will likely need to be modified. Delays to (1) the environmental review process and (2) the New Starts application process both have the potential to affect the timing of the federal funding commitment for the Mid-Coast Project, as described below.

New Starts Application Process

Only projects in the approved New Starts program budget are eligible for an FFGA. In order to apply for an FFGA, staff is preparing a New Starts application to be submitted to the FTA this September. The New Starts Application is used to rate projects nationwide. The Mid-Coast Project was last rated at “medium high” for Entry to Preliminary Engineering. A “medium” rating is considered a good rating for any New Starts Project for positioning a project to receive federal funding. This fall the Mid-Coast Project must be re-rated to advance into the Engineering phase of the New Starts Program, and for inclusion in the FTA FY 2016 funding recommendations for the President’s Budget. By early fall of this year, staff also will provide the FTA with a number of project development documents required by the FTA to approve the Mid-Coast Project to advance to the Engineering phase. FTA approval to enter Engineering is the formal action needed to advance the project from the Project Development phase to the Engineering phase of the New Starts Program.

San Diego Fairy Shrimp

In March of this year, San Diego Fairy Shrimp, a federally listed Endangered Species (Fairy Shrimp), were discovered in a small depression with pooled water within the railroad right-of-way during pre-construction surveys requested by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The

¹ The FFGA is the federal commitment to fund a percentage of total project cost. SANDAG is seeking a federal funding commitment for approximately 50 percent of the Mid-Coast Project cost.
current schedule for approval of the Final SEIS/SEIR is anticipated to be delayed one to five months as a result of the discovery of the Fairy Shrimp.

Prior to this recent survey, no Fairy Shrimp had been detected within the proposed project construction area. Accordingly, the Fairy Shrimp are a new, unaddressed biological impact. With the discovery of the Fairy Shrimp, a Section 7 consultation with the USFWS is required under the Federal Endangered Species Act. To meet CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, the analysis of impacts to the Fairy Shrimp will likely need to be addressed through the circulation of a focused SEIS/SEIR prior to final approval of the SEIS/SEIR by FTA and SANDAG.

Staff has identified several potential mitigation sites for the impacted Fairy Shrimp and is developing a mitigation plan in consultation with the USFWS. However, the USFWS Section 7 consultation, circulation of a focused SEIS/SEIR, and applicable comment period could add between one and five months to the final CEQA and NEPA approvals, depending on the level of comments and review time by the USFWS and FTA. Staff is working closely with the USFWS and FTA staff to expedite review times and completion of the Section 7 consultation due to this unforeseen issue. Completion of the Section 7 consultation with the USFWS is required before FTA can issue the ROD.

Based on initial discussions with FTA and the resource agencies, SANDAG staff believes it should be possible to complete a focused circulation and obtain a ROD early enough to make it into the FY 2016 President’s Budget recommendation and receive an FFGA in fall 2015.

**I-5 Bridge Crossing**

With the approved Refined Build Alternative, the I-5 crossing south of Nobel Drive was shifted 360 feet south of the location shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The shifting of the I-5 crossing has raised public concerns, the majority of concerns coming from a residential community, Cape La Jolla Gardens, located near the southerly I-5 crossing. As noted above, the relocation of the crossing was just one of the many revisions proposed as part of the Refined Build Alternative in response to comments received on the alignment shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

With such comments, concerns were raised about the effects on views caused by the location of the bridge and straddle bents supporting the bridge as originally proposed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. As part of any decision to change the crossing location, additional engineering and environmental analysis was required to verify grades, alignment, and utility impacts, and to determine if any new and significant environmental impacts were caused by shifting the alignment south from the location shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The environmental analysis showed no additional impacts at the revised location based on the noise and view parameters used to assess the impacts of the Mid-Coast Project, which are based on established FTA criteria taking into consideration sensitive receptors such as residential housing, hotels, and educational facilities, which are all found along the proposed alignment for the project.

Objections to the location of the I-5 bridge crossing in the Refined Build Alternative are based on the southerly location being closer to Cape La Jolla Gardens, and that the revised location was not

---

2 The proposed I-5 crossing is located south of Nobel Drive where the Project alignment transitions from the east side of I-5 to the west side.
included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR before it was circulated for public review and comment. The Cape La Jolla Gardens Condominium homeowners association was notified of the proposed change shortly before Board consideration of the Refined Build Alternative in November 2013. However, residents have challenged whether this was enough time for them to adequately consider and comment on the proposed change and have indicated the potential for litigation if the location of the I-5 crossing is not moved back to the northerly location shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

Staff believes the environmental analysis supports the location of the I-5 crossing in the Refined Build Alternative. In order to address the timing concerns raised by the Cape La Jolla residents, staff could recirculate the portion of the environmental documents addressing the revised location of the I-5 bridge crossing. Circulation of a supplemental report on the location of the I-5 bridge crossing would provide the opportunity for public comment on the analysis of the southerly I-5 bridge crossing. Circulation of a supplemental report for this issue would require preparing the focused supplemental report, circulation for public comment, a public meeting, and preparing responses to comments prior to completion of the Final SEIS/SEIR. Circulation of a supplemental report for the I-5 crossing is anticipated to result in a delay of the issuance of an ROD by approximately 6 to 9 months to spring 2015, thus eliminating the ability for the Mid-Coast Project to make it into the FY 2016 President’s Budget.

Alternatively, the Board of Directors could revise the Refined Build Alternative to include the I-5 crossing in its northerly location as shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. As this alignment was subject to public comment during circulation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, reverting to the Draft SEIS/SEIR alignment would eliminate the need to circulate a supplement report for the I-5 crossing since the public had the opportunity to provide input during the Draft SEIS/SEIR public comment period.

**Potential Schedule Impacts**

The FTA typically makes its final funding recommendations to the President in February for the next federal fiscal year. A project would need to have an approved ROD and a recommendation by the FTA for Entry to Engineering to receive such a funding recommendation.

- **Fairy Shrimp** – As noted above, circulation of a supplemental report for the Fairy Shrimp could add one to five months to the NEPA and CEQA approval, and issuance of the ROD. Although the time frame for completing a recirculation and obtaining CEQA and NEPA approvals for only the Fairy Shrimp issue would provide a narrow window to achieve environmental approvals and obtain the ROD ahead of the FY 2016 New Starts funding recommendation, staff believes there is strong potential to work closely with the FTA to obtain FTA concurrence that would still allow the project to achieve an FFGA in fall 2015 (maintaining the current anticipated funding schedule).

- **I-5 Bridge Crossing** – As noted above, if recirculation is required on the I-5 bridge crossing, an additional 6 to 9 months is expected to the environmental review process. In turn, the ROD would be anticipated in spring 2015 and subsequently delay the FFGA and project completion beyond the FY 2016 funding cycle, as shown in Attachment 1.
**Design Status**

Work on design is continuing in support of the Final SEIS/SEIR and New Starts application process. Geotechnical borings, utility potholing, dry utility conflict determination and relocation coordination, bridge reports, and advancing station design concepts are all under way. In April, station concepts were reviewed with the MTS Executive Committee. The proposed concepts will be further developed with community input in the coming months. UC San Diego and VA Medical Center stations have additional internal review processes that are now getting under way.

**Mid-Coast Project Working Group**

The Mid-Coast Project Working Group (PWG) remains active in providing input and stakeholder engagement on the Mid-Coast Project. The PWG last met in November 2013, receiving a project update and a presentation on the proposed Refined Build Alternative before it was presented to the Board. The PWG is expected to meet next in mid-2014 as part of a larger process to seek public input on the design of the nine proposed Trolley stations (four at-grade and five aerial) that will be constructed as part of the Mid-Coast Project. Currently, SANDAG is in the process of updating representatives from approved PWG member organizations as certain member representatives have either left a company or have taken on other roles within the member organization. All such updates will be discussed and approved at the next PWG meeting.

**Next Steps**

Biological work has started on the Fairy Shrimp impacts and for the development of a mitigation plan to be considered by the USFWS. A Section 7 consultation on the Fairy Shrimp with the USFWS is planned with the intent on expediting the development of a biological opinion and approval of mitigation.

Additional steps related to any modifications of the Refined Build Alternative as a result of direction from the Board will be developed and reviewed, as needed. Finally, design will continue in preparation for the federal funding application process and SANDAG plans to work with the Construction Manager/General Contractor on design review as part of the Pre-Construction Services, in addition to coordinating with the Mid-Coast PWG and the community to gain input for station design.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Mid-Coast Corridor Project Summary Schedules

Key Staff Contacts:  
John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, john.haggerty@sandag.org  
Leslie Blanda, (619) 699-6907, leslie.blanda@sandag.org
## Mid-Coast Corridor Project Summary Schedules

### NOTES

**Fairy Shrimp**
1. CEQA and ROD time frames will vary based on the length & number of comments and review cycles from the resource agencies & public.
2. In February, the FTA proposes New Starts projects in a report for President’s budget. A ROD and input for the report must be completed in December.
3. The Fairy Shrimp delays to the ROD date may reduce or close the window for completing input to the FTA for the New Starts recommendation report in February.

**I-5 Bridge**
1. CEQA and ROD time frame has additional public outreach and assumes additional time to prepare responses to public comments and for review by the FTA.
2. The time to complete outreach, respond to comments and have a ROD is likely to be in the Spring of 2015. This time frame would miss the FY2016 federal budget process.

---
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Approval of Award to Construction Manager/General Contractor

CM/GC Procurement Method

- Board Approved CM/GC Contracting Method
- Best value selection - experience, ideas, team approach and cost
- Advantages of CM/GC method
  - Early collaboration contractor, designer, SANDAG
  - Continuous value engineering, costing and constructability
  - Negotiated Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for construction
  - Reduce changes
  - Ownership of design
CM/GC Contract Phases

Two Contract Phases:

- **Pre-Construction Services Contracts**
  - Design team member, constructability, phasing, costing
  - Subcontracting plan and community support
  - UDBE and DBE participation

- **Construction Services Contracts**
  - Negotiated guaranteed maximum price contracts
  - One or more contracts for each project
  - UDBE and DBE subcontracting and monitoring
  - Single point coordination

CM/GC 1 Projects

"CM/GC 1"

1. Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
2. Elvira to Morena Double Track Project
3. San Diego River Bridge Double Track Project

Board approved using CM/GC contracting method on April 26, 2013 (Mid-Coast) and June 28, 2013 (LOSSAN)
SANDAG CM/GC Procurement Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement Step</th>
<th>Board Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Selection Criteria</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Proposals for Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Technical Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortlist for Interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold &amp; Score Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open &amp; Score Cost Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Technical, Interview &amp; Cost Scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Proposer for Pre-Construction Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize GMP Construction Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Approved Evaluation Criteria

Approve Selection and negotiation of Pre-Construction Services

Authorize GMP Contracts for Construction

Approved Evaluation Criteria

Proposal Scoring
- Technical 150 points
- Interview 50 points
- Cost Factor 50 points
- Total 250 points

Seven Technical Proposal Categories
- Team Experience: Max 20 points
- Contractor Experience: 35 points
- Management Experience: 10 points
- Subcontracting Plan: 20 points
- Pre-construction Phase: 20 points
- Construction Phase: 30 points
- Safety: 15 points
- Total 150 points
CM/GC Evaluation Committee

Nine Member Technically Qualified Team
• Four SANDAG senior engineers
• UC San Diego construction services director
• Caltrans project manager
• MTS capital project manager
• NCTD chief development officer
• City of San Diego senior engineer

CM/GC Proposers

Four Well Qualified Joint Venture Proposals
• Kiewit/Sundt - Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. and Sundt Construction Inc.
• Mid Coast Transit Constructors - Stacy & Witbeck, Inc., Skanska USA, and Herzog Contracting Corporation
• San Diego Transit Constructors - Flatiron West, Inc., URS Energy & Construction Inc., and Granite Construction Company
• WCAR - Walsh Construction Company, Clark Construction Group, Atkinson Constructors, LP, and Railworks Projects, Inc.
Final Ranking Process

Score Proposal → Score Interviews → Score Cost Factor → Sum and Rank → Tiebreaker 1 Cost Factor → Tiebreaker 2 Tech Points → Final Rank

Ranking Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANEL MEMBERS</th>
<th>FINAL SCORES AND RANKINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WCAG/VALSI/CRKL/ATRRLW/RCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Ranking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two #1 Ranked Proposers
Tiebreaker

First Tiebreaker - Cost Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Initial Rank</th>
<th>Cost Factor</th>
<th>First Tiebreaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Transit Constructors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiewit/Sundt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Process

Proposal Scoring
- Technical 150 points
- Interview 50 points
- Cost Factor 50 points
- Total 250 points

Seven Technical Proposal Categories

- Team Experience*: 20 points
- Contractor Experience: 35 points
- Management Experience: 10 points
- Subcontracting Plan: 20 points
- Pre-construction Phase: 20 points
- Construction Phase*: 30 points
- Safety: 15 points

Max points
- Total 150 points

* Second tiebreaker criteria – Sum all points in two categories for a total of 450 points.
Results

Second Tiebreaker / Final Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>First Tiebreaker</th>
<th>Second Tiebreaker</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Transit Constructors</td>
<td>50 points</td>
<td>391.0 points</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiewit/Sundt</td>
<td>50 points</td>
<td>364.5 points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Evaluation

- Pass/Fail at Proposal - Bonding and financial statement
- Detailed Financial Analysis – audits, operating capital, cash flow, credit

Next Steps

- Selection of CM/GC for Pre-Construction Services
- Negotiate and execute Pre-Construction contracts – June/July 2014
- Board approval of Construction Services contracts – early 2015 through 2016
The Board of Directors is asked to approve selection of a Construction Manager/General Contractor and authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute Pre-Construction Services contracts with Mid Coast Transit Constructors for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, the Elvira to Morena Double Track Project, and the San Diego River Bridge Double Track Project.

Financial Evaluation

• Pass/Fail Analysis
  – Bonding Capacity and Surety Letter(s) indicating ability to obtain performance and payment bonds in an amount of $1 Billion U.S. Dollars.
  – Completed Statement of Experience and Financial Conditions – Information on Project Experience

• Additional Financial Analysis
  – Review of most recent three (3) fiscal years of audited financials to complete financial strength review
    • Review of financials for individual firms for information on capital structure, operating cash flow, commitments and line of credit
CM/GC 1 Evaluation Process

Evaluation Process Approved by Board:

– Selection Based on Combination of:
  • Experience/Qualifications – 150 points maximum
  • Interview – 50 points maximum
  • Cost Factor – 50 points maximum

– 3 steps:
  • Review and Scoring of Technical Proposals to Determine Short-List for Interviews
  • Scoring of Interviews – All firms short-listed and interviewed
  • Scoring of Price based on Formula in RFP

Technical + Interview + Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM/GC 1 (NO. 500141)</th>
<th>FINAL SCORES AND RANKING</th>
<th>MID-COAST TRANSIT CONSTRUCTORS (STACY &amp; WITBECK / SKANSA / HERZOG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCAM (HAKIEN / CLARK / ARUNSON / RAILWORKS)</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO TRANSIT CONSTRUCTORS (PLATINUM / URS / GRANITE)</td>
<td>CMI / SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA/joint ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. 1A</td>
<td>Eval. 1B</td>
<td>Eval. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.65</td>
<td>163.01</td>
<td>206.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.33</td>
<td>170.64</td>
<td>183.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.25</td>
<td>191.86</td>
<td>215.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.99</td>
<td>207.54</td>
<td>236.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.50</td>
<td>178.21</td>
<td>208.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.50</td>
<td>201.71</td>
<td>216.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.25</td>
<td>178.86</td>
<td>245.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.90</td>
<td>194.61</td>
<td>232.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.25</td>
<td>197.41</td>
<td>224.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Overview

- *TransNet* Early Action Project
- 11-mile extension of San Diego Trolley Blue Line
- Old Town Transit Center to Westfield UTC
- Nine new stations (parking at five)
- 21,000 daily boardings north of Old Town
Final SEIS/SEIR Status

• November 2013, Board approved the Refined Build Alternative
  – Comments received on Draft SEIS/SEIR
  – Additional analysis
  – Coordination with agencies and stakeholders
• Preparing responses to 1400+ comments and associated additional analysis
• Administrative Draft Final SEIS/SEIR submitted to FTA

Final SEIS/SEIR Next Steps

• Respond to FTA comments on Administrative Draft Final SEIS/SEIR
• SANDAG Board approval of Final SEIR under CEQA
• FTA approval of Final SEIS under NEPA (Record of Decision)
New Starts Process

New Starts Steps to Full Funding Grant Agreement
- Rated into New Starts pipeline
- Environmental cleared – ROD
- Entry to engineering (MAP 21)
- New Starts recommendation in federal budget

2016 New Starts Recommendation - Advantages
- Keeps Mid-Coast on schedule for FFGA in 2015
- Maintains cost estimate and financial plan (delay = escalation)
- Mid-Coast is known and supported by the Administration
- Maintains place in FFGA pipeline

Final SEIS/SEIR Fairy Shrimp

- Discovered during wet season monitoring
- Listed as Endangered Species
- Unavoidable impact
- Biological assessment and identified mitigation site
- Requires circulation focused NEPA/CEQA Supplement
- Impact to ROD 1-5 months
Fairy Shrimp Schedule Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Fairy Shrimp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplement &amp; Comment Period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1-5 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
<td>Feb 2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requires NEPA/ROD by December 2014 for 2016 budget recommendation

Refined Build Alternative

Refinements from Draft SEIS/SEIR
1. Added VA Medical Center Station
2. Eliminated straddle bents option at Genesee Ave. and I-5
3. Alignment on UC San Diego moved to south side of Voigt Dr.
4. Shift I-5 crossing south of Nobel Dr. 360 feet further south
5. Parking layout changes at stations
6. Revised substation locations
7. Revised construction staging areas
I-5 Crossing South of Nobel Dr.

- I-5 Crossing Revised to Accommodate Views in Final SEIS/SEIR
  - Evaluated: LRT alignment, spans, future freeway managed lanes
  - Assessed: noise and visual, no new impacts within criteria
- Shifted 360 feet south from Draft SEIS/SEIR crossing
- Re-evaluation Requested by Residential Community
  - Insufficient notice and public input
  - Noise and visual intrusions

I-5 Crossing South of Nobel Dr.

Two Options
- Keep Final SEIS/SEIR south alignment– requires supplemental review
- Return to Draft SEIS/SEIR north alignment– requires minor update to Final SEIS/SEIR
Northbound I-5

South LRT Alignment

North LRT Alignment

Existing

Northbound I-5

North LRT Alignment

North LRT Alignment

Existing

Existing
### I-5 Crossing Schedule Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>I-5 LRT Crossing North</th>
<th>I-5 LRT Crossing South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplement &amp; Comment Period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1-5 Months</td>
<td>4-6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requires NEPA/ROD by December 2014 for 2016 budget recommendation

### Schedule Summary

![Schedule Summary Diagram](image-url)
Design Status

• Ongoing Design - geotechnical, utility, bridge type selection and coordination with LOSSAN projects
• Station Design - preparing community outreach

Next Steps

• Prepare Fairy Shrimp Supplement, and circulate for comment – Summer 2014
• Complete Final SEIS/SEIR on the I-5 alignment as directed
• Station architecture community meetings – Summer 2014
• Update PWG membership – Mid 2014
Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to discuss and provide further direction on potential modifications to the Refined Build Alternative for inclusion in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project.

Fairy Shrimp Schedule Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Fairy Shrimp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplement &amp; Comment Period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1-5 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Late 2018 - Early 2019</td>
<td>Late 2018 - Early 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requires NEPA/ROD by December 2014 for 2016 budget recommendation
View 4 – Temple Looking South

I-5 Crossing Schedule Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>I-5 LRT Crossing North</th>
<th>I-5 LRT Crossing South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplement &amp; Comment Period</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1-5 Months</td>
<td>4-6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Fall 2015*</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Late 2018 - Early 2019</td>
<td>Late 2018 - Early 2019</td>
<td>Late 2019 - Early 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Requires NEPA/ROD by December 2014 for 2016 budget recommendation
Development Near the Trolley Line

Morena Linda Vista

Hazard Center

Rio Vista

Fenton Parkway
I-5 Crossing Alternatives

Refined Build Alignment (south alignment)/ Draft SEIS/SEIR Alignment (north alignment)

- Similar LRT speeds, curves, grades and bridge spans
- Noise and visual impacts within acceptable limits of applicable criteria
- South alignment is legally defensible with supplemental review
- North alignment is legally defensible with minor revision to Final SEIS/SEIR
- South alignment supplemental review has significant risk of delay

Refined Build Alternative

Refinements in Final SEIS/SEIR

1. Added VA Medical Center Station: improves ridership, hospital and UC access, strong public support.
2. Eliminated Genesee Ave. straddle bent: reduce impacts and public comments.
3. Alignment to south side of Voigt Dr: mitigate impacts to imaging equipment.
4. Eliminated straddle bents at I-5 crossing: address comments and design analysis
5. Shift I-5 crossing 360 ft south: address visual comments, after engineering, noise and visual analysis.
6. Parking changes at stations: result of refined design.
7. Revised substation locations: result of refined load flow analysis.
8. Revised construction staging areas: comments from property owners and pending site developments.
## Summary of Schedule Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Fairy Shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C I-5 Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental
- 2014: July 2014
- 2015: Sept 2014
- 2016: Feb 2016

### New Starts
- 2014: July 2014
- 2015: Sept 2015
- 2016: Feb 2016

### LRT Construction
- 2014: Fall 2014
- 2015: Fall 2015
- 2016: Fall 2015

### Recommendations
- 2016: Operations - Spring 2018
- 2017: Operations - Spring 2019
- 2018: Operations - Early 2020

### Key Dates
- CEQA: Late 2014
- FFGA: Fall 2014
- Operations: Spring 2019
Dear Mr. David Hicks,

Please see the attached color photo of the Church taken yesterday from the La Jolla Village Square parking lot. Imagine this one of a kind view being eliminated.

Hopefully the good human spirit and hearts of the SANDAG Board of Directors will not let this view be replaced by a three story parking structure and an elevated concrete trolley station with electrical poles and wires.

The Church and the Cape La Jolla Gardens have their concerns, but there are many more reasons why this is not a good fit. The congestion the proposed parking structure and trolley station would cause with other problems will be mind boggling. At the March 13 Meeting SANDAG representatives said an underground trolley station at Nobel Drive would be too expensive. This was a solution suggested by those attending.

The La Jolla Village Square area is unique in that there are two high traffic food stores and other businesses whereby people need to get in and out and congestion is already an issue. My wife and I live across the street and walk this area nearly every day.

We understand that the nearby VA Hospital trolley station was added to this Project. The VA Hospital and the State already have a parking lot and land in that area. That would seem to be a better area for a parking structure if it is needed. Could this be given consideration?

Hopefully the proposed parking structure and trolley stop at the La Jolla Village Square will be removed from this Project because of the Visual, Noise, Congestion, and other problems that would result.

Please forward this communication to the SANDAG Board of Directors involved in the decision making process and the upcoming May 9 meeting. I am mailing several of these color photos of the Church taken from the La Jolla Village Square Parking Lot to you so they can be included in the materials for the May 9 Meeting.

David your assistance is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steve Arndt
Chair Community Relations Committee at Villas Mallorca Complex on Villa La Jolla Drive.
May 9, 2014

Chairman Jack Dale
San Diego Association of Governments
Board of Directors
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Agenda Item 3
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Update
I-5 Bridge Crossing

Dear Chairman Dale:

I represent the Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association ("CLJG"), a residential community located west of I-5 and south of La Jolla Village Square. CLJG is supportive of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, but opposed to the realignment of the I-5 crossing adopted in the Refined Build Alternative on November 15, 2013. CLJG respectfully requests the SANDAG Board to revise the Refined Build Alternative to include the I-5 crossing in its northerly alignment as shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.

CLJG has actively participated in the public input process for the Mid-Coast Transit Project; members of the HOA Board have attended numerous public workshops and followed the project closely. In June 2013, SANDAG hosted several workshops during the public comment period for the Draft SEIS/SEIR. At these workshops, SANDAG represented the I-5 crossing along the northern alignment shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Although CLJG wasn't necessarily supportive of the Trolley Station at Nobel Drive, it remained supportive of the project and did not raise any concerns.

On November 8, 2013, representatives from SANDAG contacted the President of the HOA, Mike Krupp, and requested a meeting to review changes in the project. Mr. Krupp met with representatives from SANDAG on November 13, 2013; wherein he was informed the Board would consider a revised alignment of the I-5 Crossing on November 15, 2013. CLJG was not provided an opportunity to review any technical analysis of the impact of this realignment on CLJG. The Draft SEIS/SEIR showed the trolley alignment 275 feet from CLJG, the Refined Build Alternative places the trolley alignment within 120 feet of CLJG. CLJG believes the realignment of the I-5 crossing adopted as part of the Refined Build Alternative will have a significant visual impact and a significant noise impact on the residents west of I-5 and south of La Jolla Village Square.
The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") requires recirculation of an environmental impact report ("EIR") if significant new information is added to the document after commencement of the public review period but prior to certification of the final EIR. Pub. Resources Code §21092.1, CEQA Guidelines §15088.5, Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of the University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112. The revised document must provide the public with the same opportunity to "test, assess, and evaluate the data and make an informed judgment as to the validity of the conclusions to be drawn therefrom." Sutter Sensible Planning, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 122 Cal.App.3d 813, 822.

The technical data relied upon by SANDAG in adopting the Refined Build Alternative is not adequate to fully analyze the impact of the realignment of the I-5 crossing on the communities west of I-5 and south of La Jolla Village Square. The visual impact analysis is performed from a point that is nearly 225 feet from the proposed tracks, rather than from the nearest point where the tracks come within 120 feet of CLJG. (See Exhibit 2) Similarly, the noise impact analysis failed to consider the impact of trolley noise during the night, when freeway noise is much lower. The revised alignment will bring the trolley within 120 feet of the bedroom windows of the residents of Cape La Jolla Gardens. The trolley will run from 4:30 am to 12:30 am daily. As each trolley approaches and leaves the station, the trolley is required to sound a horn. None of these aspects of trolley operation were discussed in the noise analysis relied upon by SANDAG staff to recommend realignment of the I-5 crossing. (See Exhibit 3)

The realignment of the I-5 crossing was substantial new information that should have disclosed the new alignment would have a significant impact not previously considered on the communities west of I-5. Recirculation of the Draft SEIS/SEIR was required to allow the public a full opportunity to test, assess and evaluate the data and make an informed judgment as to the validity of the conclusions reached by the Board when it adopted the Refined Build Alternative.

The staff report accompanying the Refined Build Alternative leads the reader to believe the alignment was changed in response to comments received in opposition to straddle bents along the alignment. (See Exhibit 1, p.2-6.) I requested a copy of all comments received related to the I-5 crossing and/or straddle bents. In my review, I noted there was one comment from Dan Allen which stated:

Volume 1, Section 4.15, Historic, Archaeological and Paleontological Resources (Cultural Resources) Mention should be made of the unmitigated aesthetic assault that will be the massive "outrigger bent" crossing structure over Interstate 5. Few freeways are considered things of beauty by the general public, but the work proposed for the Mid-Coast LRT will be a visual blight compared to today's experience traveling I-5
All other comments related to straddle bents were directed to the straddle bents proposed along Genesee Avenue. Our review of records also indicates a request from the Church of Latter Day Saints to revise the alignment. However, this request was made months before the Draft SEIS/SEIR was published. If SANDAG was inclined to revise the alignment based on the request from the Church, this could have been done prior to publication of the Draft SEIS/SEIR, thus avoiding the need to recirculate the document.

It seems clear the I-5 crossing was realigned to address the special interests of a church to the detriment of a residential community. Whereas, the alignment in the Draft SEIS/SEIR was 800 feet from the church and 275 feet from CLJG; the new alignment is 1,000 feet from the church and 120 feet from CLJG. There is little merit to impacting an entire community to accommodate little benefit to a church located 800 feet from the proposed crossing.

CLJG requests the SANDAG Board of Directors revise the Refined Build Alternative to include the I-5 crossing in its northerly location as shown in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Without the change, SANDAG is required to recirculate the Draft SEIS/SEIR, causing a substantial delay in the certification of the Final SEIS/SEIR. Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Julie M. Hamilton
Attorney for
Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association
MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT:
REFINED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Introduction

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project is a TransNet Early Action project that will extend the Metropolitan Transit System Blue Line Trolley from Santa Fe Depot in downtown San Diego to University Towne Centre (UTC) through the University of California, San Diego (UC San Diego) campus.

The review and comment period for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) closed on July 17, 2013. More than 300 individuals, organizations, and agencies submitted comments. Based on comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR and further analysis, refinements are proposed to the Build Alternative. This report presents the proposed refinements to the Build Alternative and requests that the Board approve the Refined Build Alternative as the final project evaluated in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

Discussion

The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Refined Build Alternative Report (Attachment 1) presents the proposed Refined Build Alternative to be evaluated in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Final SEIS/SEIR. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require that the “preferred alternative” being considered in the Final SEIS be identified without options. The Build Alternative included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR included two options (discussed in more detail below) for initial consideration, which must either be included or excluded from the Build Alternative prior to evaluation of the project in the Final SEIS/SEIR. In addition, several comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR have resulted in recommended changes to the alignment, stations, or other elements of the Build Alternative.

This report presents a brief summary of the proposed refinements detailed in the attached Refined Build Alternative Report.
Draft SEIS/SEIR and Comment Period

The FTA and SANDAG recently completed the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft SEIS/SEIR. SANDAG serves as the lead agency for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, and FTA serves as the lead agency for compliance with the NEPA.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR evaluated a Build Alternative and a No-Build Alternative. The Build Alternative included two options: the Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center Station Option and the Genesee Avenue Design Option. The VA Medical Center Station Option includes an additional station at the VA Medical Center. The Genesee Avenue Design Option uses straddle bents instead of center columns for the aerial alignment along Genesee Avenue in University City.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR was available for a 60-day public review and comment period, which extended from May 17 through June 17, 2013. Approximately 1,420 comments were received from more than 300 individuals, organizations, and agencies. All of the comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR will receive a response in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

Several comments were received on the VA Medical Center Station Option and the Genesee Avenue Design Option that evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Approximately 45 comments expressed strong support for inclusion of the VA Medical Center Station Option into the project; no comments were received against the inclusion of this station. Approximately 10 comments were received expressing opposition to the use of straddle bents on Genesee Avenue.

In addition, several of the other comments received during the comment period have the potential to affect the alignment, stations, traction power substation locations or construction staging areas included in the Build Alternative. These comments are summarized in Section 2.2 of the Refined Build Alternative Report. Each comment with the potential to affect the Build Alternative was analyzed and a refinement to the Build Alternative is proposed where warranted by the further analysis. A detailed response to each of these comments will be provided in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

After the close of the comment period, input was received from the public concerning the Tecolote Station that will be addressed as part of the staff presentation.

Proposed Refinements to the Build Alternative

The proposed refinements to the Build Alternative are described in detail in the Refined Build Alternative Report and summarized below:

- Include the VA Medical Center Station Option
- Eliminate the Genesee Avenue Design Option
- Eliminate straddle bents from the Interstate 5 crossing south of Nobel Drive; shift the crossing slightly to the south
- Realign the viaduct from the north side of Voigt Drive to the south side of Voigt Drive
- Refine the Clairemont Drive Station design to include a bus stop; eliminate the need for pedestrian ramps from Clairemont Drive to Morena Boulevard
• Refine parking structure layout at Nobel Drive Station

• Shift UC San Diego East Station location slightly to the east

• Acquire 260 parking spaces at UTC Station from Westfield in lieu of adding parking

• Refine the design of several traction power substations, eliminate two substations, and shift location of several other substations

• Eliminate four construction staging areas and add two new staging areas

• Eliminate two retaining walls and add two bridges north of La Jolla Colony Drive near the La Paz condominiums

A map of the proposed Refined Build Alternative is provided on pages 31-32 of Attachment 1.

Next Steps

Revisions to the project engineering plan set and environmental analyses will be prepared to support the Refined Build Alternative in the Final SEIS/SEIR document. A response to each comment submission will be included in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The Final SEIS/SEIR will be prepared during late 2013 and early 2014. Publication of the Notice of Availability, after review and approval by FTA, is anticipated in mid-2014. Certification and approval of the project and its environmental document by the Board of Directors would be after the 30-day review period for the Final SEIS/SEIR. FTA project approval with a Record of Decision is expected in fall 2014.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Refined Build Alternative Report

Key Staff Contacts: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, john.haggerty@sandag.org
Leslie Blanda, (619) 699-6907, leslie.blanda@sandag.org
Refined Build Alternative Report
Draft Rev 3 November 6, 2013

Prepared by:
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) recently completed the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). The Draft SEIS/SEIR was available for review and comment from May 17, 2013 through July 17, 2013. Approximately 1,420 comments were received during the comment period from more than 300 individuals, organizations, and agencies.

The Draft SEIS/SEIR evaluated a Build Alternative and a No-Build Alternative. The Build Alternative included two options for consideration. One option, the Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center Station Option, evaluated an additional station at the VA Medical Center, and the other option, the Genesee Avenue Design Option, proposed straddle bents instead of center columns for the aerial alignment along Genesee Avenue in University City.

Federal regulations (23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 771) and FTA procedures for environmental review of transit projects require the Final SEIS/SEIR to identify the "preferred alternative" for evaluation in the environmental document. The regulations do not allow consideration of "options" in the Final SEIS/SEIR. Thus, a decision is required on the options evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The Final SEIS/SEIR also is required to discuss all substantive comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR and responses to the comments.

Several of the comments received during the comment period warrant consideration prior to finalizing the Build Alternative for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR due to their potential to affect the alignment, stations, or other elements of the Build Alternative. Comments also were received in support of, or in opposition to, the VA Medical Center Station Option and the Genesee Avenue Design Option. Consideration of these comments, coordination with agencies and stakeholders, and the evaluation of the Build Alternative and options in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, provides the basis for refinements to the Build Alternative, or Refined Build Alternative, proposed for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

This report provides a summary of the Draft SEIS/SEIR options and the comments related to proposed project refinements, as well as a description of the proposed refinements to the Build Alternative. The report concludes with a description of the proposed Refined Build Alternative for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR.
2.0 DEVELOPMENT OF THE RENEFED BUILD ALTERNATIVE

This chapter describes the development of the Refined Build Alternative proposed for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR. Refinements are proposed to the Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Refinements are based on comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR, review of analysis in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, coordination with agencies and stakeholders, and further engineering study.

2.1 Review and Comment Period on Draft SEIS/SEIR

The Draft SEIS/SEIR was made available for a 60-day public review and comment period from May 17, 2013 through July 17, 2013. The document was distributed to all interested and concerned parties, including public agencies, elected officials, community groups and organizations, businesses, and individuals. The Draft SEIS/SEIR document and technical reports also were made available for review at area libraries and SANDAG offices, as well as posted on the website for the project (www.sandag.org/midcoast). Notices of the availability of the Draft SEIS/SEIR for review were published in five newspapers; advertisements were published in 17 local newspapers; press releases were distributed; and postcards were mailed to 37,000 residences and businesses within one-quarter mile of the project alignment.

Four public meetings and one public hearing were held during the 60-day comment period. More than 350 people attended the public meetings. Comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR were submitted via mail, e-mail, voice mail, fax, and at each meeting via comment cards or by speaking to a court reporter. Oral comments also were provided by 20 people during the public hearing held before the SANDAG Transportation Committee on June 21, 2013.

In total, 309 comment submissions (e.g., comment cards, e-mails, and letters) were received containing 1,417 individual comments. Table 2-1 lists the number of submissions and comments received by affiliation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Submissions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups/Organizations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>309</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,417</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, 2013
Note: The term "submission" refers to a comment card, e-mail, or letter containing comments. The term "comments" refers to individual comments within a submission.
The comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR addressed a variety of topics. Some included general statements of support or opposition to the project, or the options evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Other comments offered suggestions on how to improve the project through refinements, as well as requests for changes, clarification, and new or additional analysis and mitigation to the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Additionally, other comments expressed concern over environmental impacts and funding/cost-effectiveness issues in regard to the project.

The dominant themes of comments received related to the following:

- Project alternatives or features (e.g., alignment, stations, traction power substations (TPSSs), construction staging areas)
- Impacts related to biological resources, noise, and visual changes
- Impacts related to construction
- Station area circulation
- Pedestrian and bicycle access to stations
- Parking

All of the comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR will be responded to in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

2.2 Comments on the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR

The comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR were reviewed and those with the potential to result in refinements to the Build Alternative were identified. These comments can be categorized as follows:

- Comments on station locations and impacts
- Comments on alignment location and impacts
- Comments on TPSS locations and impacts
- Comments on construction staging areas and temporary construction easements and impacts

In addition to comments on project features and impacts, comments on the Build Alternative options evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR were reviewed, specifically those in support of, or in opposition to, the VA Medical Center Station Option and the Genesee Avenue Design Option.

2.2.1 Comments on the VA Medical Center Station Option and Genesee Avenue Design Option

Approximately 45 comments expressed strong support for inclusion of the VA Medical Center Station Option into the project; no comments were received against the inclusion of this station. The support for this station was consistent with the support expressed for the station in 2010 during scoping for the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
Approximately 10 comments were received expressing opposition to the use of straddle bents on Genesee Avenue. The Genesee Avenue Design Option was identified as being of particular concern because of its visual, community character, and vibration impacts.

2.2.2 Comments on Station Locations and Impacts

Comments related to station locations and impacts were focused primarily on the Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, Balboa Avenue, Nobel Drive, and UTC Transit Center Stations and associated park-and-ride facilities.

Property owners and businesses provided the majority of the comments on the Tecolote Road Station, most of which related to the acquisition of property for station parking, the displacement of one business (i.e., Armstrong Garden Center), and impacts to adjacent businesses. The comments suggested eliminating the station entirely, reconfiguring the station site, or replacing surface parking with a parking structure to avoid or reduce impacts to businesses.

Comments on the Clairemont Drive Station related primarily to the configuration of the station parking lot and the potential for it to limit or preclude future development opportunities. The comments also noted that the on-street bus stops on Clairemont Drive would be inconvenient for passengers transferring to and from the Trolley.

Residents in the neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Avenue Station provided comments, primarily related to the location of the station. The station location proposed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR is on city-owned property south of Balboa Avenue in between the railroad right-way and Morena Boulevard. The comments received suggested relocation of this station to the area north of Balboa Avenue at the City Maintenance Yard/Rose Canyon Municipal Operations Lot to avoid or reduce traffic, parking, and other environmental impacts (e.g., noise, crime, and visual) to the adjacent neighborhood. Residents also commented that the station location proposed in the Draft SEIS/SEIR was in a single-family residential area and suggested it would be more appropriate to relocate the station and accompanying bus transfer center to a more commercial area.

Representatives of the La Jolla Village Square shopping center provided comments on the Nobel Drive Station, which would be located on the west side of I-5 within the shopping center parking lot. Most of these comments related to the configuration of the proposed parking structure for the station and construction impacts, as well as access and circulation within the parking lot. The comments suggested increasing the size of the parking structure to include additional transit and commercial parking.

Representatives from the Westfield University Towne Centre (UTC) shopping center and Regency Centers (owner of the Costa Verde shopping center) expressed concerns related to the UTC Transit Center Station, which would be located in the center of Genesee Avenue at Esplanade Court/UTC Driveway, and the park-and-ride facility located within the shopping center parking lot. Westfield UTC and Regency Centers also expressed concerns with the timing of construction of the proposed Westfield UTC parking structure.
2.2.3 Comments on Alignment Location and Impacts

Comments related to the location and impacts of the alignment were focused primarily on the areas where the alignment would extend along the Interstate (I-) 5 corridor, Voigt Drive, and Genesee Avenue.

Several individuals and businesses commented on the alignment north of State Route (SR) 52, along the I-5 corridor north to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus. Comments from the Shops at La Jolla Village requested an evaluation of alternatives to avoid blocking views of the shopping center’s signage and suggested shifting the alignment to the east or moving the alignment underground to minimize visual and construction impacts to the shopping center. Comments from the Sheraton Hotel expressed similar concerns and requested that the alignment be shifted to the east.

Both UCSD and Scripps Memorial Hospital provided comments that could affect the alignment along Voigt Drive from north of the UCSD West Station to the UCSD East Station. Comments from UCSD requested that the Voigt Drive and Campus Point Drive improvements proposed as part of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) I-5 North Coast Corridor Project be constructed at the same time as the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Comments from Scripps Memorial Hospital identified the location of sensitive medical equipment that could be susceptible to vibration and electromagnetic interference in the southwest corner of the XIMED building on the south side of the hospital campus, which is closest to the alignment on Voigt Drive. The aerial structure would be as close as 37 feet from the corner of the building. Scripps Memorial Hospital requested an analysis of the impacts and feasibility of shifting the alignment to the south away from the XIMED building.

Several individuals provided comments requesting that the project be modified to terminate at the Balboa Avenue Station or the VA Medical Center Station.

2.2.4 Comments on Traction Power Substation Locations

Comments on TPSS locations and associated noise and visual impacts under the Build Alternative focused on the Clairemont Drive Station, south of La Jolla Colony Drive, next to Charmant Drive and I-5, and on Genesee Avenue. Comments on the TPSS proposed at the Clairemont Drive Station stated that the TPSS could affect the potential for future development on the site.

Several commenters, including the University City Planning Group, requested the relocation of the TPSSs south of La Jolla Colony Drive and adjacent to Charmant Drive. The visibility of the La Jolla Colony Drive TPSS from Rose Canyon Open Space Park was expressed as a concern, as was noise impacts for users and wildlife within the park. The comments received on the TPSS on Charmant Drive noted the visual impact to the community and requested that the TPSS be relocated to the La Jolla Village Square shopping center. A City of San Diego councilmember submitted comments regarding the visual impacts of the proposed TPSSs on Genesee Avenue and suggested they be relocated.
General comments on impacts of TPSSs included statements that the noise analysis did not adequately examine the humming noise that can be an irritant to wildlife and people, and that the visual analysis did not consider mitigation for the visual impacts. Screening or undergrounding all TPSSs to reduce visual and noise impacts was suggested.

2.2.5 Comments on Construction Staging Areas and Construction Easements

Several property owners along the alignment expressed concerns with proposed staging areas. Comments from the Shops at La Jolla Village stated that the construction staging area/temporary construction easements on its property would affect access to loading docks. Comments from the Westfield UTC shopping center expressed concerns that the proposed construction staging area at the shopping center would result in parking and traffic impacts to the shopping center, particularly during the holiday season. The comments from Regency Centers/Costa Verde shopping center and Costa Verde Hotel (Monte Verde and La Jolla Canyon Gardens properties) stated that the construction staging area proposed on the Monte Verde property would conflict with the planned site for two condominium towers and would impact parking for shopping center tenants.

In addition, comments were received from the University City Planning Group expressing concerns related to temporary construction easements at Scripps Memorial Hospital and temporary loss of hospital parking.

2.3 Refinements to the Build Alternative

Refinements are proposed to the Build Alternative based on comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR, additional analysis of impacts identified in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, and coordination with agencies and stakeholders. The resulting proposed Refined Build Alternative would be evaluated in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The proposed refinements include the addition of the VA Medical Center Station; refinements to the light rail transit (LRT) alignment, stations, TPSSs, and construction staging areas; and further engineering refinements. The Genesee Avenue Design Option is proposed to be eliminated from further consideration. The following sections summarize the refinements to the Build Alternative.

2.3.1 Addition of VA Medical Center Station Option

The option for an additional station at the VA Medical Center was evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR, including comments from the US Department of Veterans Affairs, strongly support the addition of the VA Medical Center Station. No comments were received in opposition to the station. The Draft SEIS/SEIR evaluation concluded that the addition of the VA Medical Center Station would improve access to the UCSD West Campus as well as to the VA Medical Center and would produce approximately 1,600 boardings daily. No adverse or significant environmental impacts were identified for the VA Medical Center Station in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Based on the strong support for the station and the results of the evaluation, it is proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.
2.3.2 Elimination of Genesee Avenue Design Option

The Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR provided for center columns supporting the aerial structure along Genesee Avenue with roadway widening where necessary to accommodate the center columns. To reduce right-of-way acquisitions associated with the center column design, the Genesee Avenue Design Option was developed, which used straddle bents in place of some center columns to support the aerial structure and stations on Genesee Avenue west of Regents Road.

The evaluation of impacts of the Genesee Avenue Design Option in the Draft SEIS/SEIR found that the option would result in significant and unavoidable visual impacts along Genesee Avenue and adversely affect the character of the community. Although the amount of right-of-way acquisitions would decrease slightly under the Genesee Avenue Design Option, the number of acquisitions would be the same and temporary construction easements would be greater than for the Build Alternative.

Comments received from property owners along Genesee Avenue and the community expressed opposition to the Genesee Avenue Design Option. Based on the results of the evaluation and the opposition expressed, the Genesee Avenue Design Option is proposed to be excluded from the Refined Build Alternative evaluated in the Final SEIS/SEIR.

2.3.3 Refinements to LRT Alignment

The proposed refinements to the LRT alignment include changes to the location and design of the crossing of I-5 south of Nobel Drive and a shift in the Voigt Drive alignment in the vicinity of Scripps Memorial Hospital.

2.3.3.1 I-5 Crossing South of Nobel Drive

Under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the LRT alignment would cross I-5 approximately 1,500 feet south of Nobel Drive. In the Draft SEIS/SEIR Plan Set, two straddle bents were included to support the aerial structure over the northbound and southbound lanes on I-5.

A refinement to the Build Alternative was developed that improves visual aesthetics through the elimination of the straddle bents. The refinements to the I-5 crossing south of Nobel Drive are shown in Figure 2-1. The refinement would relocate the crossing to the south by approximately 360 feet. Although the Draft SEIS/SEIR did not identify any visual impacts at the crossing location, it did identify that the straddle bents associated with the aerial structure over I-5 would not be visually consistent with the aesthetics and scale of the built environment at this location and would contrast with the setting. Several comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR expressed opposition to the use of straddle bents along the alignment. The elimination of the straddle bents at the I-5 crossing would improve aesthetics and is proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

2.3.3.2 Voigt Drive Alignment

Under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the LRT alignment in the vicinity of Scripps Memorial Hospital would be located on the north side of Voigt Drive. Comments from Scripps Memorial Hospital on the Draft SEIS/SEIR identified the location of sensitive medical equipment that could be susceptible to vibration and electromagnetic
Figure 2-1. Refinements to I-5 Crossing South of Nobel Drive

Source: SANDAG, 2013
interference in the XiMED building located on the south side of the hospital campus, which is closest to the alignment. The comments requested that an alignment south of Voigt Drive, away from the XiMED medical office building, be considered and evaluated.

Further analysis of electromagnetic field impacts on the XiMED building determined that the project could affect the equipment located in the XiMED building even with the proposed mitigation at the source evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Based on these findings and the comments from Scripps Memorial Hospital, a refinement to the Build Alternative was developed that would shift the LRT alignment to the south side of Voigt Drive. With the shift, the project-related electromagnetic interference at the XiMED building would be substantially reduced. The refinement to the Voigt Drive alignment is shown in Figure 2-2. The refinement was reviewed with UCSD and Scripps Memorial Hospital, and is proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

**Figure 2-2. Refinements to Voigt Drive Alignment**

Source: SANDAG, 2013
2.3.4 Refinements to Stations

The refinements to stations in the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR include changes to the configuration of the Clairemont Drive Station park-and-ride lot and removal of the pedestrian ramps, reconfiguration of the parking structure at the Nobel Drive Station, relocation of the UCSD East Station to accommodate the change in alignment on Voigt Drive, and acquisition of parking spaces at the UTC Transit Center instead of construction of a parking deck for transit patrons. The refinements to these stations are described in the following section, and are all proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

The stations at Tecolote Road, Balboa Avenue, UCSD West, and Executive Drive as defined in the Draft SEIS/SEIR are proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative without substantial changes. No comments were received that would affect the UCSD West Station or the Executive Drive Station.

2.3.4.1 Tecolote Road Station

Although comments were received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR to reconfigure or eliminate the Tecolote Road Station to avoid the acquisition of Armstrong Garden Center nursery, it is proposed to continue with the design as evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Further study in response to the comments determined that elimination of the station would reduce the project’s transit ridership and increase parking demands at the Old Town Transit Center (OTTC) and Clairemont Drive Stations. It also was determined that alternative site designs to avoid the acquisition of the nursery would shift the impact to other adjacent businesses and reduce the visibility and access to the station. In addition, it was determined that the replacement of the proposed surface parking with a parking structure would still require acquisition of Armstrong Garden Center and also would increase the cost of the project.

2.3.4.2 Balboa Avenue Station

Although many comments were received regarding the Balboa Avenue Station, it is proposed to continue with the design as evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Many comments requested that the Balboa Avenue Station be relocated to the City of San Diego Maintenance Yard to the north side of Balboa Avenue or be eliminated entirely. Although the City Maintenance Yard site could accommodate the station and provide sufficient space to meet the forecasted station parking demand, relocation of the station would reduce transit ridership because of the reduced accessibility of the station for transit passengers driving to the station from the south, east, and west, as well as the increase in out-of-direction travel for buses serving the station. The station provides an important connection for bus routes serving nearby communities, and elimination of the station would substantially affect ridership.

2.3.4.3 Clairemont Drive Station

Under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, bus transfers at the Clairemont Drive Station would be accommodated by on-street bus stops on Clairemont Drive east of Morena Boulevard. Pedestrian ramps were provided for access to the station from Clairemont Drive to Morena Boulevard. Comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR noted that the on-street bus stops on Clairemont Drive would be inconvenient for passengers transferring to and from the Trolley.
A refinement to the Clairemont Drive Station was developed that provides for bus transfers within the Clairemont Drive Station parking lot. The relocation of the bus transfer location eliminates the need for the pedestrian ramps from Clairemont Drive to Morena Boulevard. Transit passengers transferring between bus and the Trolley would cross Morena Boulevard at the existing signalized crosswalk at Ingulf Street located at the south end of the station platform. Figure 2-3 illustrates the layout of the Clairemont Drive Station proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

Figure 2-3. Refined Clairemont Drive Station

Source: SANDAG, 2013

2.3.4.4 Nobel Drive Station
Under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the Nobel Drive Station provided for a 600-space joint-use parking structure to be constructed at the La Jolla Village Square shopping center. The structure would include 260 transit parking spaces as well as 340 replacement parking spaces for the surface parking spaces lost as a result of constructing the station and parking structure at the shopping center.
Comments on the Draft SEIS/SEIR were received from the property owner opposing the design of the proposed parking structure. Coordination with the property owner and further engineering refinements resulted in a change in the layout of the parking structure, which would include replacement parking spaces and 260 transit parking spaces. Figure 2-4 illustrates the layout of the Nobel Drive Station proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

Figure 2-4. Refined Nobel Drive Station

Source: SANDAG, 2013

2.3.4.5 UCSD East Station
A refinement to the location of the UCSD East Station was necessary to accommodate the shift in the LRT alignment to the UCSD campus on the south side of Voigt Drive. With the shift in the LRT alignment, the station has been relocated to the east to accommodate the proposed alignment and avoid conflict with the planned future UCSD track and field facility. The station would span the planned future location of the realigned Campus Point Drive. Figure 2-5 illustrates the layout and location of the UCSD East Station proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

2.3.4.6 UTC Transit Center
The UTC Transit Center platform would be located in the center of Genesee Avenue, south of Esplanade Court/UTC Driveway. Under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, the station was proposed to include 260 transit parking spaces in a joint-use parking structure at the Westfield UTC shopping center. The parking structure would be constructed by
Westfield as part of the planned expansion of the shopping center. The transit parking spaces would be constructed as an additional level on the parking structure.

Comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR indicated concerns regarding the timing of the parking structure construction by Westfield and commitment of funds by SANDAG. Design of the shopping center parking structure is currently underway, with construction scheduled to begin in mid-2014, prior to the scheduled date of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the project. Because SANDAG cannot commit funds for construction prior to the ROD, the 260 transit parking spaces will be provided by acquisition of parking spaces above the minimum site requirements from the UTC shopping center. Figure 2-6 illustrates the layout of the UTC Transit Center Station proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.
2.3.5 Refinements to Traction Power Substations

Electricity to power the Trolley system extension will be provided by TPSSs located at grade along the LRT alignment. The Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR was anticipated to require 18 TPSSs, including 3 replacement substations on existing sites between Santa Fe Depot and the OTTC and 15 new substations. Refinements are proposed to the number and location of the TPSSs based on the results of a load flow analysis. Figure 2-7 shows the location of the refinements proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.

The load flow analysis identified a requirement for 16 TPSSs, 2 fewer than the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. The TPSSs proposed at the OTTC and on Anna Street north of the San Diego River were determined to be unnecessary based on the results of the load flow analysis. Other proposed refinements to the TPSS locations include the following:

- Relocation of the substation at the Wright Street Yard to the south within the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) property (Inset 1 in Figure 2-7)
- Relocation of the substation at Baker Street to the Clairemont Drive Station parking lot (Inset 2 in Figure 2-7)
- Relocation of the substation with the City Yard site north of Balboa Avenue (Inset 3 in Figure 2-7)
Figure 2-7. Refinements to Traction Power Substations

Source: SANDAG, 2013
Figure 2-7. Refinements to Traction Power Substations (continued)

Source: SANDAG, 2013
Figure 2-7. Refinements to Traction Power Substations (continued)
- Relocation of the substation on Charmant Drive to the west side of I-5 within the Caltrans right-of-way at the south end of the La Jolla Village Square shopping center property (Inset 4 in Figure 2-7)
- Relocation of the substation on Voigt Drive from north of the UCSD baseball field to east of I-5 and south of Voigt Drive (Inset 5 in Figure 2-7)
- Relocation of the substation at Genesee Avenue and La Jolla Village Drive to the east of Genesee Avenue to the San Diego Gas & Electric substation facility on Fez Street (Inset 6 in Figure 2-7)

2.3.6 Refinements to Construction Staging Areas

The Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR included 15 construction staging areas. Some of these were located at future park-and-ride lots, station areas, and existing parking lots. Vacant areas near the project alignment also were identified as staging areas. Refinements were made to the number and location of construction staging areas based on comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR or due to proposed refinements to the LRT alignment. Four construction staging areas are proposed for elimination based on comments received on the Draft SEIS/SEIR:

- Site on Charmant Drive on the east side of I-5
- Site at the parking lot of Scripps Memorial Hospital located east of I-5 and north of Voigt Drive
- Site on the Monte Verde property at La Jolla Village Drive and Genesee Avenue
- Site on the UTC Westfield property

To address the proposed shift in the alignment from the north to the south side of Voigt Drive, an additional construction staging site has been identified. This site is on the UCSD parking lot located east of I-5 and south of Voigt Drive where the new substation would be located. All of the other sites under the Build Alternative in the Draft SEIS/SEIR are proposed to be retained under the Refined Build Alternative for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The refinements to the construction staging areas proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative are shown by location in Figure 2-8.

2.3.7 Other Engineering Refinements

Other proposed engineering refinements, as a result of further engineering studies, include changes in retaining walls and bridges. The proposed refinements to the LRT alignment required review of the design of retaining walls. Retaining wall designs were refined based on the adjustments to the horizontal and vertical alignment changes. The most notable change is the elimination of two retaining walls and the addition of two bridges north of La Jolla Colony Drive near the La Paz condominiums. The refinements to these retaining walls and the addition of two bridges are proposed for inclusion in the Refined Build Alternative.
Figure 2-8. Refinements to Construction Staging Areas
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Figure 2-8. Refinements to Construction Staging Areas (continued)

Source: SANDAG, 2013
3.0 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF Refined BUILD ALTERNATIVE

This chapter presents a summary description of the proposed Refined Build Alternative for evaluation in the Final SEIS/SEIR. The proposed alternative is a refinement of the Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. It includes the addition of the station at the VA Medical Center and the refinements to alignment, stations, and TPSSs developed in response to comments, coordination with agencies and stakeholders, and further engineering refinements.

The proposed Refined Build Alternative would extend the Trolley Blue Line from Santa Fe Depot in Downtown San Diego to the UTC Transit Center in University City. The project would use the existing Trolley tracks for approximately 3.5 miles, from the Santa Fe Depot to north of the OTTC and south of the San Diego River. The Trolley Blue Line trains would share the existing tracks with the Trolley Green Line trains. The project also would include construction of 10.9 miles of new double track that would extend from south of the San Diego River to the terminus at the UTC Transit Center.

The new extension would follow the Los Angeles—San Diego—San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN) tracks within existing MTS and City of San Diego right-of-way from the Santa Fe Depot to north of the I-5/SR 52 interchange. The alignment would then leave the LOSSAN right-of-way and parallel the east side of the I-5 corridor traveling north partially within Caltrans right-of-way and partially on private property. South of Nobel Drive, the alignment would transition to an aerial structure and cross over to the west side of I-5. From Nobel Drive, the alignment would continue north to the UCSD West Campus, cross back over to the east side of I-5 and along the south side of Voigt Drive to Genesee Avenue, and continue south in the median of Genesee Avenue to the UTC Transit Center.

The proposed Refined Build Alternative would include 9 new stations (4 at grade and 5 elevated); 5 park-and-ride facilities with 1,070 parking spaces; 14 new and 2 upgraded TPSSs; and 36 new low-floor LRT vehicles. No new maintenance facilities are needed. New stations would be located at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, Balboa Avenue, Nobel Drive, the VA Medical Center, UCSD West, UCSD East, Executive Drive, and the UTC Transit Center. Figure 3-1 shows the project alignment and station locations under the proposed Refined Build Alternative, and Figure 3-2 shows the plan and profile along with locations of stations and TPSSs.

The operating plan for proposed Refined Build Alternative is the same as described for the Build Alternative in Chapter 2.0 of the Draft SEIS/SEIR. With the extension of the Trolley Blue Line, continuous service would be provided from the San Ysidro Transit Center at the U.S.—Mexico international border to University City. The service would be provided every 7.5 minutes during peak and off-peak periods in 2030.
Figure 3-1. Proposed Refined Build Alternative
In July 2013, an assessment of the visual impacts that would be associated with a southward shift in the location of the crossing of Interstate 5 (I-5) was conducted. Specifically, the assessment was intended to determine whether shifting the crossing approximately 500 feet to the south would result in new significant impacts that were not reflected in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report. It was determined that any potential change in impacts associated with the shift would be limited to the northeastern units of the Cape La Jolla Gardens condominium complex and any impacts would be less than significant for the reasons described below.

The July 2013 study of the I-5 realignment and its visual impact on the Cape La Jolla Gardens condominium complex did not result in a written report. The site was visited and representative photographs were taken (see photos in Attachment 1). The assessment of the site conditions and these photos concluded that the crossing of I-5 was visually compatible with the transportation corridor, would only be visible from a small number of residences due to project location, existing fencing, walls and vegetation. The views of the alignment at this location would be partially obscured from these residences by existing trees, freeway vegetation, and privacy fencing. Additionally, the alignment would not be visible from any of the exterior gathering areas used by residents (recreational areas/pool, etc.). For these reasons, it was determined that no further visual analysis or visual simulations were required, and impacts would be less than significant.

The Refined Build Alternative presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors included an approximately 360-foot southward shift in the location of the I-5 crossing compared to what was in the Draft SEIS/SEIR, which would represent a reduction in the visibility of the crossing compared to the 500-foot shift assessed in July 2013. The characteristics of the crossing (e.g., elevation, column supports) did not change substantially, and it was concluded that as with the 500-foot shift, the 360-foot shift also would not represent new significant visual impacts.

A visual simulation of the alignment crossing 360 feet south of Draft SEIS/SEIR alignment as seen from the second story condos in Cape La Jolla Gardens was prepared in response to recent requests from Cape La Jolla Gardens (Attachment 2). The visual simulation confirms the conclusions reached in the July 2013 study.
Attachment 1: Photographs taken in July 2013

Cape La Jolla Gardens looking east at I-5 from stairs at northeast corner of complex

Source: SANDAG, 2013
Cape La Jolla Gardens adjacent to I-5 looking northeast along property wall

Source: SANDAG, 2013

Looking east from ground floor of condominium complex

Source: SANDAG, 2013
Attachment 2: Visual Simulation Prepared in March 2014

View from the approximate elevation of a second story balcony looking east at I-5

Existing Conditions

![Existing Conditions Image]

Source: SANDAG, 2014

Proposed Conditions
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Source: SANDAG, 2014
Date: November 1, 2013

To: Leslie Blanda, San Diego Association of Governments

From: Dennis Henderson, Parsons Brinckerhoff and Steven Wolf, ATS Consulting

Subject: Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project—Noise Impact Assessment of the Alignment Change at the I-5 Crossing South of Nobel Drive

The noise and vibration impact analysis presented in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) (SANDAG, 2013) was updated to assess the effects of the alignment change at the Interstate 5 (I-5) crossing south of Nobel Drive. A description of and plans for the new I-5 crossing alignment are presented in the Final Refined Build Alternative Report, December, 2013 and the Final SEIS/SEIR Plan Set, October, 2013.

Noise Sensitive Receivers

The noise sensitive receivers that are in close proximity to the new I-5 crossing are shown on Figure 1 and described below.

- Receiver Site 1 – Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints San Diego Temple. This site is referred to as Cluster 70 in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
- Receiver Site 2 – Multi-family apartment buildings on Charmant Drive. This site is referred to as Cluster 69 in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
- Receiver Site 3 – Las Flores Apartments on Charmant Drive. This site is referred to as Cluster 68 in the Draft SEIS/SEIR. Noise measurement Site LT-11 identified in the Draft SEIS/SEIR was at this location.
- Receiver Site 4 – Las Flores Apartments on Charmant Drive. This site is referred to as Cluster 67 in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
- Receiver Site 5 – Cape La Jolla Gardens Condominiums. This site was not included in the Draft SEIS/SEIR.
Existing Conditions

The existing noise levels at Receiver Sites 1 through 4 were estimated based on the 24-hour noise measurements conducted at Site LT-11, North Charmant Avenue, and presented in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Noise and Vibration Impacts Technical Report (SANDAG, 2013). The noise measurement at Site LT-11 was performed at Receiver Site 3, an apartment complex on Charmant Drive, over a 24-hour period starting at 10:00 a.m. on March 9, 2011. The microphone was located on the lawn in front of the patio of one of the units facing Charmant Drive. The primary noise sources were traffic on I-5 and local traffic on Charmant Drive. There were also several periods during the daytime hours when it appears that activities at the apartment complex, such as landscaping, contributed to the overall noise level. These activities are typical for a residential neighborhood. The measured 24-hour day/night level ($L_{dn}$) at this site was 88 A-weighted decibels (dBA).

Adjacent to Receiver Site 5, a 24-hour noise measurement was conducted at the northeast corner of Cape La Jolla Gardens on June 25, 2013. The location of the 2013 measurement is shown in Figure 2. The measured $L_{dn}$ at this location was 71 dBA. The primary source of existing noise at this location is the traffic on I-5.
Environmental Impacts

The noise and vibration levels from LRT operations were predicted using the FTA detailed impact assessment methodology as described in the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Noise and Vibration Impacts Technical Report (SANDAG, 2013). The predicted noise levels are presented in Table 1 for FTA noise Category 2 residential land uses and Table 2 for FTA noise Category 3 institutional land uses, which include religious facilities. Noise impacts are not predicted to occur at any of the evaluated noise sensitive receiver sites.

The predicted vibration levels are presented in Table 3 for FTA for vibration Category 2 residential and vibration Category 3 institutional land uses. No vibration impacts are predicted to occur at any of the evaluated receiver sites.
# Table 1. Noise Impacts — Category 2 Sensitive Receivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Draft SEIS No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Near Track Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Design Speed (mph)</th>
<th>L_{eq} (dBA) Impact Threshold *</th>
<th># of Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Cluster 69</td>
<td>Multi-family residences</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63 67 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Cluster 68</td>
<td>Las Flores Apartments</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63 68 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Cluster 67</td>
<td>Las Flores Apartments</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61 66 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cape La Jolla Gardens Condos</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66 70 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ATS Consulting, 2011 and 2013  
Notes:  
* The FTA project noise impact threshold for Category 2 residential receivers.  
* Project is the noise created by the new LRT operations.

# Table 2. Noise Impacts — Category 3 Sensitive Receivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Draft SEIS No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Near Track Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Design Speed (mph)</th>
<th>L_{eq} (dBA) Impact Threshold *</th>
<th># of Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Cluster 70</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69 74 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ATS Consulting, 2011 and 2013  
Notes:  
* The FTA project noise impact threshold for Category 3 institutional receivers.  
* Project is the noise created by the new LRT operations.
### Table 3. Project Vibration Impacts—Category 2 and 3 Sensitive Receivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver</th>
<th>Draft SEIS No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Near Track Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Design Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Adjustments $^a$</th>
<th>Vibration Level (VdB)</th>
<th>Exceeds General Assessment Criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Cluster 70</td>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1, W, B</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Cluster 69</td>
<td>Multi-family residences</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2, W, A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Cluster 68</td>
<td>Las Flores Apartments</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2, W, A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Cluster 67</td>
<td>Las Flores Apartments</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2, W, A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cape La Jolla Gardens Condos</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2, W, A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ATS Consulting, 2011 and 2013

Notes: $^a$ Adjustments account for soil conditions (transfer mobility group 1), building construction (masonry), and aerial track structure.