ITEM NO. 12

STAFF REPORT

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

DATE: November 10, 2010

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers

FROM: Development Services Department

SUBJECT: **CALTRANS INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT REVIEW AND COMMENTS**

SYNOPSIS

Staff recommends that the City Council forward all comments for the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project to Caltrans.

BACKGROUND

In June of 2010, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) released the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project. Caltrans proposes to construct four managed lanes with either a buffer or a barrier along the 3.3 mile segment of Interstate 5 within the City of Oceanside.

On August 18, 2010, the City Council directed staff to enter into a cost-sharing agreement with the City of Solana Beach to use their consultants in order to initiate a third party review of the Caltrans EIR/EIS. There were five consultants selected to complete the third party review. The following is a list of the selected consultant team:

Company	Name	Type of Review
Austin-Foust Assoc.	Joe Foust	Traffic/Transportation
Summit Environmental	Leslea Meyerhoff	Environmental
Brian F. Smith & Assoc.	Ryan Taylor	Noise
Mestre Greve Assoc.	Fred Greve	Air Quality
Ogawa Engineering	Mikhail Ogawa	Hydrology

On September 22, 2010, the City Council approved a budget appropriation in the amount of $80,000 from the unassigned Major Thoroughfare Fund balance for the third party review.

ANALYSIS

Staff worked with the City of Solana Beach and each of the five consultants to complete the review of the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor EIR/EIR. Comments from each of the five consultants are attached as Exhibit 1, Consultant Comments.

In addition to the consultant comments, a public workshop was held in the City Council Chambers on September 30, 2010, where comments from the public were received. Miscellaneous Public Comments are attached as Exhibit 2. Comments from City staff are attached as Exhibit 3.

The attached comments will be will be forwarded to Caltrans with a cover letter.

FISCAL IMPACT

Does not apply.

COMMISSION OR COMMITTEE REPORT

Does not apply.

CITY ATTORNEY'S ANALYSIS

Does not apply.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council forward all comments for the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project to Caltrans.

PREPARED BY:

David DiPierro,
City Traffic Engineer

SUBMITTED BY:

Peter A. Weiss
City Manager

REVIEWED BY:

Michelle Skaggs Lawrence, Deputy City Manager
George Buell, Development Services Director
Scott O. Smith, City Engineer

Attachments:

1. Exhibit 1, Consultant Comments
2. Exhibit 2, Miscellaneous Public Comments
3. Exhibit 3, City staff Comments

EXHIBIT 1

CONSULTANT COMMENTS

AUSTIN-FOUST ASSOCIATES, INC.
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Amberson, City of Oceanside
Dave DiPierro, City of Oceanside

FROM: Joe Foust, P.E.

DATE: November 2, 2010

SUBJECT: **I-5 FREEWAY NCCC PROJECT EIR/EIS TRAFFIC REVIEW COMMENTS**

I have reviewed several hundred pages of the I-5 NCC "Managed Lanes" Project EIR along with supporting referenced material. Before listing a number of detailed and specific comments regarding the EIRs adequacy, I wish to outline my general impression of the project itself with respect to the City of Oceanside.

For the City of Oceanside, the advantages identified for this costly $4+ Billion project are quite modest. The I-5 Freeway is widened to provide four HOV "Managed Lanes" along with construction of a new direct access ramp (DAR) at Oceanside Boulevard. Unfortunately, even these improvements are not planned for another 25+ years and only then if funding becomes available. Aside from the HOV lanes and DAR, there is essentially no other traffic mitigation proposed. The EIR identifies significant impacts such as the one created on Oceanside Boulevard by the new DAR but with no traffic mitigation. The EIR cites a conflict with the City's Circulation Element as justification to forgo the needed widening to six lanes along a two mile segment of Oceanside Boulevard.

The logic behind the "Managed Lanes" concept is to provide motorists with an alternative that, if they are willing to pay a toll, they can have relative assurance of being able to make the entire trip from Oceanside to San Diego (27± miles) in about 25 minutes. Without this $4 Billion investment, the same trip may take up to 60 minutes or longer during the worst peak periods. The "Managed Lanes" concept refers to this as the travel time "buffer" a motorist would have to be assured of arriving at his destination on time. The City of Oceanside must decide if the need for this "assurance" justifies the project cost in billions of dollars as well as local environmental impacts.

1198001mm.doc

2223 Wellington Avenue, Suite 300 • Santa Ana, California 92701-3161
Tel: (714) 667-0496 Fax: (714) 667-7952
www.austinfoust.com

The I-5 NCC project proposes to eliminate the eastbound Vista Way to northbound I-5 on-ramp at the I-5/SR-78 interchange. The EIR is not clear on the reasoning for this, but it is suspected that the weaving conflict from the southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-78 is the major factor. In any case, elimination of this on-ramp constitutes a significant issue to the residents who live in the area and the City itself. The EIR/EIS's multitude of traffic studies indicate the existing heavy freeway to freeway volume that currently uses the southbound off-ramp to Vista Way/SR-78 will be replaced by direct flyover connectors, a highly controversial issue in and of itself. This introduces the question "Why is the on-ramp being eliminated and what mitigation is proposed to support the closure?" The EIR provides little or no analysis in this regard. The elimination of a freeway on-ramp without evaluation of the impact of the diverted traffic is not an insignificant matter and should not be ignored in the EIR/EIS.

The I-5 NCC project is also proposing four new direct access ramps (DARs) along its 27 mile length. One of those locations is in the City of Oceanside at Oceanside Boulevard. The placement of a DAR at this location creates a significant traffic impact on a two mile segment of Oceanside Boulevard between the I-5 Freeway and El Camino Real. The identified mitigation is widening of Oceanside Boulevard from four lanes to six lanes. However, the EIR ignores this significant impact and does not propose any mitigation be included in the project. As a result, the City of Oceanside must ask the question, "Is having a DAR in Oceanside worth the impact is creates on Oceanside Boulevard?"

The reason for citing a DAR at Oceanside Boulevard is not clear from the EIR. A general reference is made to future planned redevelopment in Oceanside as the primary reason. However, from my initial investigation, placement of a DAR near the entrance to Camp Pendleton might also constitute a reasonable alternative. At least this "idea" needs to be evaluated as a potential alternative.

Finally, the overall need and cost of the DAR's themselves must be re-examined. The EIR acknowledges that the resulting level of service does not change with or without the DAR's. The inclusion of the four DAR's is very expensive (a precise cost is not available but it is acknowledged that substantial cost and acquisition of right-of-way is involved). In addition, the construction of the Oceanside DAR is not planned for the next 25 years, so its need could change significantly between now and then, even if it is included in the current project description.

Aside for this philosophical comment regarding the overall need and justification for this project, there are a number of specific traffic related comments regarding the adequacy of the EIR/EIS document itself.

EIR Specific Traffic Review Comments

1. The cost of this project exceeds $4 Billion, which appears excessive for what is achieved. For the City of Oceanside, only the increased capacity is that provided by two HOV lanes in each direction. Neither the 8 + 4 nor 10 + 4 alternatives add any new general purpose lanes through Oceanside. The ADT within Oceanside for the No-project is forecast as 302,000 and only increases to 320,000 ADT for the most aggressive 10 + 4 option. Based on the limited increase in capacity (counting the HOV lanes), the cost of the project is between $100,000 and $150,000 per ADT, a very high and seemingly non cost effective price. Additional analysis is needed to evaluate other potential alternatives. For example the alternative of construction of only one HOV lane in each direction must be evaluated. Similarly the alternative of one HOV lane and one general purpose lane in each direction must be analyzed.

2. The level of service for the City's Interchange's remains at an unacceptable (Caltrans standards) "D" or "E" in all alternatives. There is little change among the alternatives, including the No-Project. CEQA requires that mitigation be developed to address these unacceptable levels of service.

3. The project does little for the City of Oceanside. Moreover, any improvements are delayed until the "long term" (Post 2036) for which there is no committed funding. Two improvements provided, if they are in fact actually improvements, include the two HOV lanes in each direction and the DAR sited in Oceanside. Those two improvements (?) must be evaluated against a potential alternative which would include only two HOV lanes (one each direction) with and without the DAR. In addition with the unavailability of committed funding the EIR must evaluated the impact of the project as if only partial built whereas the improvements in Oceanside are left unbuilt.

4. The potential for a political issue regarding the acceptability of single users paying a toll to use the HOV facilities is not addressed. There is an estimate that the "managed lanes" HOV option could produce a revenue stream of between $12 and $19 million annually but this would constitute a poor return (0.4± percent per year) on a $4 billion investment. The 'managed lanes' concept allows use of the HOV lanes by single occupant vehicles (SOV) willing to pay a toll. The effect of building only two HOV lanes (instead of four) prohibiting SOV motorists from use of the HOV facility must be analyzed on both a level of service as well as financial basis.

5. The effect of a potential alternative north-south parallel route between I-5 and I-15 Freeways under study by SANDAG has not been addressed other than to mention it is being investigated. The impact of such a parallel route must be analyzed and evaluated before a decision on I-5 is made since the existence of a parallel facility would diminish or eliminate altogether the need and justification for widening I-5 and in particular the need for four HOV lanes instead of only two.

6. The travel forecast in the EIR/EIS is based upon SANDAG now out of date Series 10 data with a minor reference that the Series 10 forecasts are within 10 percent of Series 11. Firstly, the current SANDAG Series is Series 11 officially adopted by SANDAG's Board of Directors on September 8, 2006 replacing Series 10. The EIR/EIS similarly dismisses a 10 percent variance between Series 10 and Series 11 without indicating whether it is a 10 percent increase or decrease. In either case, 10 percent should not be considered insignificant. However since the entire need and justification for this project is based on future travel demand forecasts the current and best data available must be used to evaluate $4 Billion expenditure.

7. The EIR/EIS uses travel time data from 2006 while also acknowledging that the HOV lane extension north to Manchester completed in 2008 has reduced those delays by 50 percent. This produces a significant change in the "cost effective" of this multi-billion dollar project. As a direct consequence the effect of this HOV lane extension and any changes in travel demand, which may result from use of Series 11 land use data, must be evaluated to determine if this project justifies the expenditure of over $4 Billion.

8. The EIR/EIS states freeway diversion traffic will create a significant increase in local circulation congestion but provides no quantification of that statement or, more importantly, the required mitigation. Based upon one report (No. 6) included in the Appendix, Highway 101 is clearly at risk as is probably El Camino Real. CEQA requires that all significant project impacts be mitigated. Therefore the EIR must be revised to identify and evaluate the required circulation improvements needed to mitigate impacts on the local communities.

9. The I-5/SR-78 improvements are assumed to be fully implemented by the project EIR/EIS. The EIR must evaluate the impact if this does not occur or is completed at a much later date? Also, these improvements include two controversial flyovers which are not shown in the final I-5 Alternatives. They are, however, included in the back-up traffic studies listed in the Appendix. The EIR must evaluate the removal of the eastbound to northbound loop on-ramp and evaluate if that ramp can be left intact and what design changes and cost would be involved in retaining the existing loop ramp. The elimination of a existing freeway ramp without replacement in some fashion can be expected to create a significant impact unless fully mitigated.

10. There is no reference to Caltrans having prepared a Project Study Report (PSR) and/or Project Report (PR) for this specific project. These documents are required for funding any project. The EIR must include these documents as justification for the California Transportation Commission to commit funding to the project. In addition the fact that the project is only partially funded at this time must be fully evaluated and the impacts of a partially completed project mitigated.

11. From the viewpoint of Oceanside, there appears to be little benefit, certainly no mitigation improvements other than the DAR for the City of Oceanside from this project. There is only increased delay on the local circulation system and increased delay on the freeway. A substantial portion of the available funding ($4 billion) must be set aside for local circulation mitigation purposes.

12. The EIR/EIS clearly states there will be significant construction impacts associated with the project. The "mitigation," includes a note that says a, "Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be developed." In reality, the construction impacts are expected to cause major disruptions of traffic based on similar experiences with I-5 widenings in Orange County. In those cases, the local cities were provided substantial traffic mitigation to address freeway traffic diversion issues that occurred during construction. Moreover, construction of this project is expected to take years to complete. Consequentially the construction traffic mitigation measures needed may have to remain in place for long periods of time – perhaps as much as 3-5 years to fully mitigate construction traffic impacts.

Brian F. Smith & Associates

Archaeological/Biological/Historical/Paleontological/Air/Traffic/Noise Consulting

November 1, 2010

Mr. John Amberson
City of Oceanside
300 North Coast Hwy
Oceanside, CA 92054

RE: DRAFT Noise Comments - Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project - Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Amberson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the latest (June 2010) Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project as prepared by both the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and the State of California Department of Transportation County.

The project proposes to widen Interstate 5(I-5) and add High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes from La Jolla to Oceanside. The EIR separates the project into 22 separate sections between the two cities, however this review only focuses on Sections within the City of Oceanside or Sections 19-22. The intentions of this review are to identify critical areas within the EIR that should be updated in order to comply with CEQA and NEPA. My comments are as follows:

1. Section 3.15.1 of the EIR states that the Noise analysis was prepared in accordance with the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects, August 2006, and that impacts were determined when future noise levels approach the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). The EIR seems to do a good job with respect to reviewing Activity Category B areas utilizing the 67 dBA threshold but doesn't review many interior NACs of 52 dBA for sensitive areas such as residential units, hotels, churches etc. The EIR should be updated to include interior analysis within older structures along I-5.

2. The noise study should show interior noise measurements for residential areas, hotels, schools etc. These areas should be analyzed per the 2006 traffic analysis noise protocol.

14010 Poway Road, Suite A, Poway, California 92064; Phone (858) 679-8218 or (951) 681-9950; Fax (858)679-9896; www.bfsa-ca.com

3. The conclusions in the EIR noise section seems to have been generated from a noise report that was finalized in 2007 which is three years old. It seems that the EIR could not have appropriately analyzed planned, designed, and programmed projects adjacent to the freeway. The EIR preparer should contact the City of Oceanside to determine any planned, designed or programmed projects for review. The EIR should be updated to show these areas.

4. The noise study was written in 2007 however, data used within the report seems outdated and should be re-taken due to the fact that most of the data was gathered in 2004. 2004 data should not be reported as "existing" as the EIR states. The noise data for the entire EIR should be re-taken.

5. After comparing the EIR with the Noise Study, the Noise Study did not consider the residential development at the northeast terminus of Neptune Street. The EIR shows this area but no analysis was conducted. The Noise study for the report did not provide any noise measurements within the development nor were any receptors selected or modeled. The Noise study should be updated and should include new noise data to properly calibrate the noise model as well as add additional receptor areas.

6. The site plan within the noise report does not include Neptune way however, the EIR states that Neptune way will be replaced. Traffic along Neptune way is not significant however should be considered and shown in Sheet NO. 57 out of 60 within the noise report.

7. The EIR should be updated to identify how the Neptune Way Bridge will be replaced. There would appear be significant access issues to the residential development during construction which may have life safety consequences.

8. The noise models identified within the technical noise report utilize Sound 2000 which is a variation of the Sound32 noise model. This analysis procedure is not acceptable for Caltrans' projects as it is considered outdated. The noise modeling within the noise report should be re-done and should utilize the TNM Version 2.5 in order to be consistent with the 2006 Traffic Noise Protocol. Additionally, the TNM2.5 noise model should incorporate the most recent "existing" noise data.

9. Noise Receptors selected for analysis within the noise model seem to be placed in areas next to structural features, which does not accurately predict either existing or future noise levels. For example, Receptor 22.13 (Identified as Guest House Hotel) was placed in the corner of two structures, which is shielded from line of sight to the freeway. It is recommended that the noise report add additional receptors to the west of R22.13 with line of sight to the freeway which will present a more accurate representation of the existing conditions in the area. Additionally, it is recommended that the noise study investigate the interior noise levels for this hotel to see if interior noise levels will exceed the NAC of 52 dBA.

The noise report should also add a short-term monitoring location to better calibrate the noise model.

10. Figure 2-2.14am within the EIR does not identify R22.14, R22.12, R22.11, R 22.10, ST 22.2. Additionally, on this figure there is reference to R5.1 but is not discussed in the Noise report. Furthermore, Figure 2-2.14ai is missing receptors 19.5, R19.5A, R 19.6 and ST 19.1. The EIR preparer should review the Technical Noise Assessment and update all the Project Features Maps within Chapter 2 of the EIR to make them consistent with the technical noise study.

11. The Noise report should look at additional hotel areas such as the Travelodge near Monterey Drive. Receptor 22.12 identified within the noise report looks as if it was placed in the far west corner of the building farthest away from the freeway. It is recommended that the noise report add an additional receptor closer to the freeway, which will more accurately depict existing noise levels.

12. The Noise models consistently use a 5 dBA K-factors or prediction reductions due to buildings. It is recommended that the noise models be updated to include additional barriers to represent these structures instead of the 5 dBA reduction assumption. This may have been done to the barrier limitations of the outdated Sound 2000 / Sound 32 noise model. It is recommend that the noise models be updated utilizing TNM 2.5 with structural barriers used instead of K-factors.

13. The Noise Report includes many walls to mitigate the future noise increases from the Interstate 5 widening project. It is well documented that noise walls can significantly increase reflective noise levels from the freeway. The EIR should be updated to include analysis of reflective noise from the sound walls. The analysis should identify specific materials that the walls should be made of to limit this reflective noise. Sound absorbing materials should be discussed.

14. Noise receptors and short-term noise measurements (for calibration) should be taken at additional residential receptors along Mountain View Avenue. This area should also be considered in a noise wall reflectivity analysis from the 12' high noise wall proposed on the west side of the I-5 by Oceanside Blvd. There is concern that once the wall is built noise levels will raise significantly for these residences.

15. The EIR and Technical Noise report did not adequately analyze noise impacts to sensitive avian species with respect to the Fish and Wildlife 60 dBA Leq-h construction noise standards. The EIR needs to be updated to include this analysis.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the City with comments regarding the proposed Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project. If you would like any additional clarification, please call me at 760-855-3389.

Sincerely,

Ryan S. Taylor
Brian F. Smith and Associates

OCEANSIDE SEGMENT COASTAL I-5 CORRIDOR
2010 V. 2004 SOUND LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	**Sample Point**	**Location**	**Latitude**	**Longitude**	**2010 Leq**	**Worst Hour Modeled Leq**	**2004 Leq**
2	ST 19.1	1934 Soto St	33° 10.866' N	117° 21.219'W	69.2	NA	70.0
3	ST 19.2	1637 Griffin St	33° 10.894' N	117 ° 21.352 W	69.3	NA	70.0
4	ST 19.3	1501 Valencia	33° 11.050 N	117 ° 21.392 W	69.5	NA	68.8
5	ST 19.4	1326 Selma Drive	33° 11.283' N	117 ° 21.555' W	69.1	NA	X
6	ST 19.5	340 Blue Springs Lane	33° 11.273 N	117° 21.663' W	68.9	NA	68.0
7	ST 20.1	Village North Apts, 825 Vine St	33° 11.578' N	117 ° 21.929' W	68.9	NA	66.9
8	ST 20.2	Ron Ortega Recreation Park, Brooks St	33° 11.879' N	117° 22.074' W	73.7	NA	75.0
9	ST 21.1	Bush St Comm Garden Bush and Wetzel Sts	33° 12.057' N	117° 22.540' W	74.2	NA	73.0
10	ST 22.1	501 San Luis Rey Drive	33 12'28.1"N	117 23' 06.4" W	78.9	NA	80.0
11	ST 22.2	1429 Carmelo, Space #1 Sandy Shores Trailer Pk	33 12' 30.8" N	117 23' 13.9" W	59.1	NA	61.6
12	R20.8	Grant St, No address, see field map for location	33° 11.871' N	117° 22.158' W	63.6	73	NA
13	R21.18	1100 Sportfisher Way Family Recovery Center	33 12.098' N	117° 22.632' W	71.4	76	NA
14	R20.16	460 South Brooks St	33 11.719' N	117 22.030' W	68.1	75	NA

OCEANSIDE SEGMENT COASTAL I-5 CORRIDOR
2010 V. 2004 SOUND LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
1	**2010 Lmin**	**2004 Lmin**	**2010 Lmax**	**2004 Lmax**	**2010 L10**	**2004 L10**	**2010 L50**	**2004 L50**	**2010 L90**	**2004 L90**
2	63.1	66.5	69.2	81.0	70.4	71.0	68.0	69.5	65.9	68.5
3	63.9	64.0	76.3	70.5	69.1	71.5	69.1	69.5	66.9	67.5
4	62.4	X	80.3	76.9	71.9	X	69.0	X	67.3	X
5	62.7	X	74.6	X	70.7	X	68.8	X	66.8	X
6	61.0	63.0	75.4	73.0	68.9	70.0	66.8	67.5	64.7	66.0
7	63.3	X	75.6	73.9	70.6	X	68.7	X	66.7	X
8	68.5	71.5	84.2	79.5	75.4	76.0	73.3	75.0	71.4	73.5
9	72.0	X	79.4	77.1	75.3	X	74.2	X	73.1	X
10	69.6	69.5	88.1	86.5	81.2	82.0	78.3	79.5	74.8	76.5
11	61.2	X	79.5	69.6	61.2	X	58.2	X	55.9	X
12	56.2	NA	77.1	NA	65.3	NA	63.2	NA	60.4	NA
13	65.2	NA	87.9	NA	72.9	NA	71.2	NA	69.0	NA
14	61.8	NA	89.1	NA	69.2	NA	67.3	NA	65.4	NA

OCEANSIDE SEGMENT COASTAL I-5 CORRIDOR
2010 V. 2004 SOUND LEVEL MEASUREMENTS

	R
1	**Notes**
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	The 2004 readings were taken during a baseball game on the ball diamond next to the Sound Level Meter. No games were in progress during our 2010 measurement.
9	
10	
11	The address in the 2004 report is shown on North Hill St. The correct address is on Carmelo
12	
13	Daycare center playground
14	

TABLE 1 – Comments for Section 3.9 Hydrology / Drainage (and Floodplains) and Associated Technical Documents

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
1	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-2	The Buena Vista Lagoon was originally an intermittent tidal system. The lagoon now functions as a freshwater lake.	There have been conceptual plans for restoring tidal functions in the lagoon. Information regarding such proposals should be researched and discussed. Tidal influences on the Buena Vista Lagoon/Creek hydraulics must be analyzed. These elevations will cause a backwater effect on the upstream water surface elevations in the lagoons and watercourses, which will influence the hydraulic analyses. The full range of backwater elevations associated with tidal variations must be considered in the hydraulic analyses to ensure that water surface elevations and flood inundation are not being increased by the project. If increases occur, then mitigation measures must be identified.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
2	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-2	Sedimentation could pose a long term threat to the fresh water marsh and open water mosaic that currently exist at the lagoon.	The impact of the project on sediment transport and sedimentation need to be analyzed. The sediment transport impacts must be quantified and discussed to ensure that the project will not adversely affect scour or deposition at or near the project site. Sediment transport impacts are not necessarily localized near the project footprint, but can extend upstream or downstream. Adverse scour could jeopardize the stability of existing utilities or improvements along the watercourses and lagoons. Buried utilities that can be impacted by increased scour must be identified. Adverse deposition can increase water surface elevations and the potential for flood inundation in properties along the rivers.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
3	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-3 and 9-8.	During a 100-year storm event, 8,500 cfs would flow beneath the I-5 bridge.	The June 23, 1994, *Hydrologic Study for Buena Vista Creek Basin*, by Hunsaker & Associates San Diego, Inc. established updated flow rates for Buena Vista Creek, which have been required by the city of Oceanside. For example, the updated 100-year flow rate at El Camino Real is 12,800 cfs, which is significantly higher than the DEIR flow rate obtained from FEMA. The hydraulic analyses and bridge design must be based on the most up-to-date hydrologic information to ensure that the proper flow rates are being utilized.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
4	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-6	The proposed replacement bridge would consist of two rows of piers, with sixteen piers in each row.	Pier (and abutment) scour analyses must be performed to determine the local scour. Impacts of local scour on sediment transport or adjacent improvements (utilities, etc.) must be described and mitigation provided. HEC-RAS provides four methods for computing losses through a bridge. A discussion comparing the four methods and rationale for the preferred method must be included in the DEIR to ensure that the proper methodology is being used.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
5	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-7	Manning's Roughness Coefficient	Roughness coefficients were assigned based on a single vegetative condition. Analyses need to be performed for the potential range of channel and overbank roughnesses that can occur over time to ensure that all future vegetative and development conditions are considered.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
6	Section 9: Buena Vista Lagoon Location Hydraulic Study / Page 9-7	Starting Water Elevation	The downstream water surface elevation was based on a single elevation. Analyses should be performed for the potential range of tidal elevations for the reasons noted in the comment above.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
7	Section 10: Loma Alta Creek Location Hydraulic Study / Page 10-1	Impacts to the Loma Alta Creek 100-year floodplain from the proposed widening to the Interstate 5	Impacts to the 100-year floodway must be analyzed. FEMA and local agency development regulations are associated with floodway impacts and there are specific conditions that must be met if floodway impacts are requested. The *Location Hydraulic Studies* must demonstrate a tie-in with the upstream and downstream FEMA floodplain and floodways. The FEMA regulations (Title 44, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 65.6) require tie-ins within specified limits. The hydraulic analyses and floodplain/floodway mapping must demonstrate that the proper tie-ins are achieved in accordance with FEMA regulations.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
8	Section 10: Loma Alta Creek Location Hydraulic Study / Page 10-6	Existing Floodplain Conditions	This section describes Soledad Canyon and Carmel Valley Creek. Revise section for Loma Alta Creek so that its existing conditions are documented.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
9	Section 10: Loma Alta Creek Location Hydraulic Study / Page 10-6	Manning's Roughness Coefficient	Roughness coefficients in the natural portions of the floodplain were assigned based on a single vegetative condition. Analyses need to be performed for the potential range of roughnesses that can occur over time. A low roughness was used to simulate flow in areas with housing such as the mobile home park. The roughness must be increased to reflect the flow obstruction associated with the structures or the structures should be included in the cross-section modeling to ensure an accurate determination of the water surface elevations.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
10	Section 10: Loma Alta Creek Location Hydraulic Study / Page 10-7	Discharge	The Garrison basin has been constructed and another detention basin is in the process of being constructed. Based on a conversation with the city of Oceanside, it is unknown if the third basin will ever be constructed. Recent hydrologic analyses have been performed for the NCTD project. The flow rates used in the hydraulic modeling need to be based on the most up-to-date hydrologic modeling and must also consider the condition with and without the third detention basin.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
11	Section 10: Loma Alta Creek Location Hydraulic Study / Page 10-7 and 10-9	HEC-RAS Output and Risk Assessment	The results show the project will cause an increase in the 100-year water surface elevation at the upstream side of the Interstate 5 bridge. The increases extend into the existing retail development upstream of Interstate 5. The impacts on the existing development must be identified and mitigation provided. Title 44, Part 60.3(d)(3) of the *Code of Federal Regulations* applies to projects that will occur within a FEMA-mapped floodplain and floodway. The regulation states that the local flood administrator must: > Prohibit encroachments, including fill, new construction, substantial improvements, and other development within the adopted regulatory floodway unless it has been demonstrated through hydrologic and hydraulic analyses performed in accordance with standard engineering practice that the proposed encroachment would not result in any increase in flood levels within the community during the occurrence of the base flood discharge [i.e., the 100-year discharge]. This condition must be addressed as well as the requirements if deviations to this condition are sought, regardless of how small. Analyses need to be performed to delineate a revised floodway boundary, if necessary. This will ensure that the proposed project can adequately meet the federally mandated floodplain and floodway regulations.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
12	Section 11: San Luis Rey River Location Hydraulic Study / Page 11-8	Manning's Roughness Coefficient	Roughness coefficients were assigned based on a single vegetative condition. Analyses must be performed for the potential range of channel and overbank roughnesses that can occur over time in order to ensure that the project is adequately designed for all future conditions.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
13	Section 11: San Luis Rey River Location Hydraulic Study / Page 11-9	Discharge	The City of Oceanside indicated that the US Army Corps of Engineers recently performed updated hydrologic analyses for the San Luis Rey River. The analyses must be obtained, reviewed, and the hydraulic analyses updated with the newer flow rates, if appropriate. Impacts on the existing levees must be discussed in order to demonstrate that the project will not adversely impact the levees. Mitigation for impacts must be provided.	Wayne Chang, P.E.
14	Location Hydraulic Studies – Tech Document	General	Caltrans' bridge hydraulic design criteria is based the 50-year storm or the flood of record (with minimum of 2 feet of freeboard) as well as the 100-year storm. The Location Hydraulic Studies only discuss the 100-year storm. The other Caltrans' required events should also be analyzed and compared to ensure that the proper freeboard is being provided at the bridges and to ensure that Caltrans' criteria is met. Since Interstate 5 is a major transportation corridor, it is critical that adequate freeboard with the factor of safety specified by Caltrans is met.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.9 HYDROLOGY / DRAINAGE (AND FLOODPLAINS) AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
15	3.9.1 / page 3.9-1	General	The section is titled "Hydrology/Drainage (and Floodplains)." However, the section focuses on floodplains and does not discuss local drainage impacts, specifically to Oceanside. The widening project will increase the impervious area, which will increase surface flow rates and flow volumes. The impacts and mitigation associated with local storm flows must be addressed. The city of Oceanside has public storm drain systems that can be adversely impacted by additional storm flow contributions from the proposed project. This can lead to greater surcharge and flood inundation along the public facilities. The DEIR must identify the downstream drainage facilities within the city, impacts on the facilities associated with increased runoff from the project, and the appropriate mitigation.	Wayne Chang, P.E.

TABLE 2 – Comments for Section 3.10 Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff and Associated Technical Documents

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
1	3.10 / General		The DEIR/EIS does not include any discussion of hydromodification impacts. The DEIR/EIS should provide adequate discussion and analysis to demonstrate how the project impacts or does not impact the receiving waters downstream of the projects discharge points. Revise DEIR/EIS as noted above and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
2	3.10 / General		In general, the DEIR/EIS provides background information but no substantive analysis of: (1) impacts from the proposed alternatives, and; (2) mitigation measures. Instead the discussion focuses on Caltrans' existing programs and plans. The supposition is that if these plans and programs are implemented it will adequately mitigate for project impacts. There is no analysis to support this in the document or supporting technical document. The DEIR/EIS should study and provide impacts and proposed mitigation measures, not only discuss in general terms. Revise DEIR/EIS as noted above and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
3	3.10 / General		Failure to study impacts and mitigation. There is no discussion regarding water quality impacts of increased traffic outside of the I-5 corridor. Increased traffic is a pollutant generating activity and will generate increased amounts of similar pollutants that the use of I-5 generates. Mitigation should be applied for the arterials and local streets that are impacted by the project, both during construction and post-construction. Temporary and permanent water quality Impacts will likely include, but not be limited to, increased trash and sediment, oil and grease, heavy metals, organics and other pollutants. Mitigation should include, but not be limited to, treatment control systems designed and implemented for the local and arterial streets that are impacted by the project, both during construction and post-construction. Revise DEIR/EIS as noted above and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
4	3.10 / General		Many statements should be referenced within the section. Examples include: Developed land use percentages, both existing and future years (page 3.10-3 under individual hydrologic unit discussions) Provide references to supporting documents / studies in DEIR/EIS and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
5	3.10.2.2 / page 3.10-4	Maximum rainfall intensity - The larger the drainage area, the lower the pollutant concentration	This appears to be a typo or misstatement. Should be corrected Revise DEIR/EIS as noted above and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
6	3.10.2.2 / page 3.10-4	Drainage Areas – The larger the drainage area, pollutants for highways decrease.	It is unclear what this statement means. Pollutant concentrations from highways decrease due to dilution from a larger drainage area? Clarify in DEIR/EIS and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
7	3.10.2.2 / page 3.10-4	Drainage Areas – The larger the drainage area, pollutants for highways decrease.	It is unclear what this statement means. Pollutant concentrations from highways decrease due to dilution from a larger drainage area? Clarify in DEIR/EIS and recirculate for comments.	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
8	3.10.2.4 / page 3.10-5	As part of Caltrans runoff characterization studies, we identified pollutants that are discharging with a load or a concentration that commonly exceeds allowable standards and which are considered treatable by Caltrans approved treatment BMPs. These pollutants are referred to as Targeted Design Constituents (TDCs), which include sediment, metals (total and dissolved zinc, lead and copper), nitrogen, phosphorus and general metals. Below is a table listing the 303(d) receiving water bodies within the project limits and the TDCs associated with them.	This paragraph and the associated table (Table 3.10.5) only identify TDCs that are the same as the impairments in water bodies adjacent or beneath the project. This method of identifying TDCs that match existing impairments is misleading when discussing project cumulative impacts and potential mitigation for such impacts. The project's cumulative impacts will occur over time and therefore, future impairments would have to be considered. All pollutants that are associated with the project should be addressed in the mitigation (treatment control BMPs) – not only those that match existing water body impairments. Unmitigated pollutant discharges, only because they are not adding to a regulatory impairment now, will have longer lasting impacts in the future. All pollutants must be mitigated. Revise DEIR/EIS to include analysis of all pollutants generated as a result of the project and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
9	3.10.3 / General		TDCs and potential pollutants from project polluting generating activities should be clearly identified as impacts. Revise DEIR/EIS to include this identification and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
10	3.10.3 / General		There is no discussion regarding aerial deposition from pollutant generating activities associated with the project and its effects on water quality. [Section 3.13 does discuss aerially deposited lead but in a completely different context]. There will be pollutant generating activities that create pollutants that are aerially deposited. These pollutants have immediate impacts (directly deposited into receiving waters) and impacts to urban runoff water quality through cumulative build up of pollutants on project surfaces and of other local areas. These impacts should be included in the discussion of Environmental Considerations as well as in the Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures. The analysis of impacts should include identification of specific pollutants, the project sphere of influence (considering winds) and the increased concentrations likely to be found as a result of the alternatives. Revise DEIR/EIS to include analysis of the project's impacts on aerial deposition of pollutants generated by the project recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
11	3.10.4 / General		This section provides background for methods of mitigation; however it is apparent that the document is written with lacking analysis towards specifics of the project. The general approach of the project proponent is to rely upon existing plans and programs to address both construction impacts and post-construction impacts. There is no demonstration that the existing programs, identified as the Statewide Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) that Caltrans implements, are effective and therefore cannot be used as mitigation for the proposed impacts. Further analysis of the mitigation measures is warranted – particularly with respect to the construction phase as well as Design Pollution Prevention BMPs and Treatment BMPs. Revise DEIR/EIS to include the analysis of existing programs effectiveness as noted above and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
12	3.10.4 / page 3.10-9	Table 3.10.9	Column headers appear to be mislabeled. The 10+4 alternatives have less disturbed soil than the 8+4 alternatives. Clarify/confirm DEIR/EIS as noted above and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
13	3.10.4 / page 3.10-10	Maintenance BMPs	There is no detail provided for what BMP activities would be included and how frequently these would be performed. There is a reference to a Maintenance Staff Guide, but it should be more explicitly described in this DEIR. Revise DEIR/EIS to include explicit maintenance information and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
14	3.10.4 / page 3.10-10	Design Pollution Prevention BMPs	Some analysis is warranted at this time to determine feasibility of implementing these BMPs throughout the project corridor. Additionally, Hydromodification impacts should be considered with specific criteria that triggers the downstream protection of waterways in this DEIR/EIS. This document defers analysis of adequate mitigation. It is feasible to perform the necessary analysis to develop mitigation for the proposed impacts as a part of this document. Revise DEIR/EIS to include analysis of site specific mitigation measures and considerations for hydromodification as a result of the project and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
15	3.10.4 / page 3.10-10	Construction BMPs	There is no mention of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans or Water Pollution Control Programs. These should be discussed in the context of development, implementation and maintaining throughout the construction phase of the project. Revise DEIR/EIS to include SWPPP and WPCP discussion and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

No.	SECTION 3.10 WATER QUALITY AND STORM WATER RUNOFF AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS	Caltrans DEIR/EIS Statement	Comment	Commenter
16	3.10.4 / page 3.10-10	Construction BMPs	There is no mention of keeping debris and pollutants from entering the receiving waters (creeks and lagoons) during active construction over the waters. The potential BMPs should be identified to mitigate these impacts. Revise DEIR/EIS to include these specific construction BMPs and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.
17	3.10.4 / page 3.10-11	Treatment BMPs - When the proposed project proceeds to the design phase, the locations of these treatment BMPs would be further evaluated to determine feasibility in relation to right-of-way limitations, environmental constraints or hydraulic capacity	Some preliminary analysis should be conducted to determine the feasibility of implementing the Treatment Control BMPs. Hydraulic and environmental constraints can be analyzed prior to final design. The alternatives each include additional impervious surfaces to be added to the existing infrastructure. Additionally, the general drainage systems are identified and therefore hydraulic needs can be estimated. With hydraulic needs identified, site sizing analysis can be conducted. This document defers analysis of adequate mitigation. It is feasible to perform the necessary analysis to develop mitigation for the proposed impacts as a part of this document. Revise DEIR/EIS to include analysis of site specific mitigation measures and considerations for hydromodification as a result of the project and recirculate for comments	Mikhail Ogawa, P.E.

Fred Greve, P.E.
Mestre Greve Associates
Division of Landrum & Brown

Air Quality Comments

Item #	Section/ Page	Caltrans Statement	City of Oceanside Comment	Author
AQ-1	AQA p. 2	Therefore, the proposed project would conform to the SIP, and there would be no regional air quality impact.	Under NEPA this may be an acceptable approach to show conformity. However, the project alternatives do vary considerably. Under CEQA, the impacts and/or benefits of the various alternatives need to be quantified both for construction and operation to determine which alternatives result in the lowest emissions and highest emissions. That is, which alternatives have the greatest impact or benefit?	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-2	AQA p. 19	The SDAPCD does not have quantitative emission limits for construction activities, nor for long term emissions that my result from increase vehicle use.	The SDAPCD (Rule 1501, 20.2(d)) does have significance thresholds that are used for stationary sources. These thresholds have been used to evaluate construction and operational activities for other projects. If a project exceeds these thresholds, then a more detailed analysis is necessary that shows that the project will not cause the ambient air quality standards to be exceeded. The absence of a significance threshold does not eliminate the need to show that the ambient air quality standards are not exceeded for local impacts from construction, traffic on the freeway, and traffic on the arterial roadways. Localized impacts from construction, traffic on the freeway, and traffic on arterial roadways have not been addressed in the EIR/EIS. These impacts must be addressed.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-3	AQA p 27	Appendix A of the 2030 RTP contains the projects included in the air quality analysis (SANDAG 2004)	Appendix A of the most recent (SANDAG 2007) 2030 RTP does not provide the more detailed descriptions claimed in the AQA. If these descriptions are no longer part of RTP then it puts the whole conformity analysis into question. The project description in the 2006 RTIP simply states, "construct HOV/Managed Lanes." Any parts of the project that go beyond this description would NOT be in conformance with the regional plans, and therefore, may have a significant regional impact. Therefore, any project alternatives that include General Purpose lanes and any project alternatives that include ramp modifications would not be in conformance with the SIP, and a regional air quality impact must be assumed unless a quantitative analysis can show otherwise. It is clear that the 10+4 alternatives include General Purpose Lanes and do not pass the conformity test. All project alternatives include major ramp modifications, and therefore, do not pass the conformity test.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-4	AQA p 27	Last paragraph	The descriptions of what are included in Appendix A of the 2030 RTP are in conflict for the area between Leucadia Boulevard and Palomar Airport Road. Under the first two descriptions only 4 Managed Lanes are included in the RTP. Under the third description the addition of 4 Managed Lanes and 2 General Purpose Lanes	Fred Greve, MGA

Fred Greve, P.E.
Mestre Greve Associates
Division of Landrum & Brown

Air Quality Comments

Item #	Section/ Page	Caltrans Statement	City of Oceanside Comment	Author
			would be allowed. The RTIP and RTP project descriptions should accurately identify the project, and the project must be completely consistent with these descriptions for the project to assume conformity and make the assertion that no regional air impacts will occur. The EIS/EIR must document more completely the project description used in the RTP and RTIP using the latest approved versions of the RTP and RTIP and provide more justification that all of the project alternatives are in fact consistent with the RTP and RTIP. Otherwise, none of the project alternatives are in conformance with the SIP and detailed regional assessments would be needed for NEPA compliance.	
AQ-5	AQA p 28	"...the proposed project is included in SANDAG's 2006 RTIP..."	The RTIP only calls out for the addition of 4 HOV Managed Lanes from San Diego to Oceanside. The 10+4 Barrier Alternative and 10+4 Buffer Alternative are not consistent with this description. Therefore, these two alternatives cannot show conformity. A regional air quality analysis must be performed for these two alternatives, and if impacts are shown, then mitigation must be provided. Additionally, the ramp modifications, particularly the Direct Access Ramps (DAR) are not shown in the RTIP or RTP and therefore, all the alternatives cannot be shown to conform to the RTP and RTIP. Therefore, all alternatives must conduct a regional air quality analysis and provide mitigation if needed.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-6	AQA p 28	The CO analysis used EMFAC2002.	EMFAC2002 has been replaced by EMFAC2007 and has been the required emission database for use for several years. The CO analysis is not valid and needs to be redone with EMFAC2007.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-7	AQA p 29	The CO analysis only examined concentrations along freeway.	Table 5 on page 29 of the AQA shows the areas assessed for potential CO violations. All of the locations are along the freeway. The arterial roadways feeding the freeway have not been assessed. If the freeway capacity increases, then the arterial roadways that feed into the freeway will see increased traffic. Since the capacities of the arterial roadways are not being increased, the Level of Service will likely go down along many of the arterial roadways, and congestion will increase. The increased congestion will lead to higher air pollutant levels. The AQA must examine the air quality impact on arterial roadways feeding into the freeway.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-8	AQA p 31	"...the project does not require a PM2.5 or PM10 conformity analysis."	The conformity analysis only addresses the regional impacts of PM2.5 and PM10, and it does not address the potential localized impacts. To satisfy CEQA the air contaminant levels of PM2.5 and PM10 adjacent to the freeway and adjacent to the arterial roadways feeding into the freeway must be assessed. PM2.5 and PM10 emissions only vary slightly with changes in speed. PM2.5 and PM10 emissions do	Fred Greve, MGA

Fred Greve, P.E.
Mestre Greve Associates
Division of Landrum & Brown

Air Quality Comments

Item #	Section/ Page	Caltrans Statement	City of Oceanside Comment	Author
			not drop dramatically when congestion is relieved. The number of vehicles is more important in determining the resultant concentrations. Since the proposed project will increase travel along I-5 and arterial roadways, it is very likely that concentrations of PM2.5 and PM10 may increase significantly along these roadways. Therefore, an assessment of local impacts from PM2.5 and PM10 is necessary.	
AQ-9	AQA p 42	"...no significant construction-related impacts to air quality have been identified..."	The assessment of construction impacts is inadequate. The construction assessment only looks at a small length of road widening and an overpass modification occurring at the same time. This grossly underestimates the amount of construction that could be occurring at any one time. The assessment ASSUMES that no soil import or export would occur; when in fact soil is commonly imported and exported for these types of projects. The section identifies that 4,000 cubic yards per day of base material will be needed, but the emissions from construction trucks hauling 4,000 cubic yards per day of base material were not assessed. This could result in an additional 800 truck trips per day; and the local impact this truck traffic could generate was not assessed. The emissions associated with construction personnel driving to and from work were not assessed. The concentration of construction emissions at residents, hospitals, and schools adjacent to the construction sites were not assessed. Localized impacts should be analyzed using a methodology like the Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. No comparison of construction emissions for the various alternatives has been provided. Once all the emissions associated with construction are correctly assessed, the emissions will be above the de minimis thresholds and additional mitigation measures will be required.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-10	AQ p 43	SDAPCD Rule 51	It should be made clear in the document that compliance with SDAPCD Rule 51 is mandatory, and therefore, it is not a mitigation measure. No mitigation measures have been proposed for construction activities.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-11	MSAT p6	Table C : Changes in Total Project MSAT Emission Rates	The project will increase air toxic emissions by 4 to 20%. To claim that dispersion modeling cannot be done, that concentrations of air toxics at adjacent residences, schools, and hospitals cannot be projected, and that the potential health impacts of this increase in air toxics cannot be projected is disingenuous. The health impacts for many similar projects have been evaluated. Methodology presented in the California Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) "Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment	Fred Greve, MGA

Fred Greve, P.E.
Mestre Greve Associates
Division of Landrum & Brown

Air Quality Comments

Item #	Section/ Page	Caltrans Statement	City of Oceanside Comment	Author
			Guidelines-The Air Toxics Hot Spot Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment," and the SCAQMD's "Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emission for CEQA Air Quality Analysis" can be modified and then used to determine the increased deaths due to the increase in air toxics.	
AQ-12	MSAT p 15	"...it is not possible to make a determination of whether any of the alternatives would have "significant adverse impacts on the human environment."	See comment above regarding methodologies that are available to determine the increase deaths due to the increase in air toxics. More importantly the MSAT study provided shows that an increase in air toxics over the No Build Alternative would occur. At a minimum for the build alternatives, a statement that a significant air impact would occur should be included, and mitigation measures provided to reduce air toxics to a level consistent with the No Build Alternative. Failing to do that, a statement of Unavoidable Adverse Impact needs to be made.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-13	EIR/EIS, p 4-3	"...an individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change."	The document uses this statement to justify that the project will not have a significant impact on GHG emissions. This statement originally stated by the Association of Environmental Professionals in March 2007, is now outdated. As directed by SB97, the Natural Resources Agency adopted Amendments to the CEQA Guidelines on December 30, 2009 to address greenhouse gas impacts. On February 16, 2010, the Office of Administrative Law approved the Amendments, and filed them with the Secretary of State for inclusion in the California Code of Regulations. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. Additionally, the California Air Resources Board has proposed GHG thresholds that may be appropriate for this project. The significance thresholds for the project's GHG emissions need to be updated and impacts need to be assessed in light of the newer requirements.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-14	EIR/EIS, p 4-4 and 4-5	"...overall CO2 emission would be reduced."	The analysis in the EIR/EIS does show that the GHG emissions would be reduced for the mainline portion of I-5. The additional traffic occurring on the freeway would be offset by slightly lower CO2 emission rates, which would occur due to less travel at slow speeds. The analysis does not quantify the construction emissions that could offset a large portion of GHG savings that are projected. GHG emissions from construction need to projected and included in the analysis of the project's impact on climate change.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-15	EIR/EIS, p S-1 and 1-	Northern terminus of project is at	Many highway projects result in a bottleneck at a terminus point. That is, when several lanes due to a widening project narrow done to only a few existing lanes, a	Fred Greve, MGA

Fred Greve, P.E.
Mestre Greve Associates
Division of Landrum & Brown

Air Quality Comments

Item #	Section/ Page	Caltrans Statement	City of Oceanside Comment	Author
	1	Harbor Drive in Oceanside.	bottleneck and corresponding congestion can occur. Such a point may occur at the northern terminus of the project in Oceanside. Additionally, an earlier phase of the project may terminate at Highway 78. The potential for these termination points to result in traffic congestion and air quality impacts needs to be assessed.	
AQ-16	EIR/EIS, p S-2	Project will incorporate a Direct Access Ramp (DAR) at Oceanside Boulevard	DARs can be great for efficiently getting vehicles on and off of the freeway, but two potential air quality need to be considered. First, the DAR will likely be squeezed in very close to existing residences and a hotel that currently exist near this interchange. This will bring a high level of traffic much closer to sensitive receptors, and a local air quality impact assessment needs to be conducted. Second, a DAR will increase considerably the traffic that travels along Oceanside Boulevard both east and west of the freeway. Homes and other sensitive receptors are located along Oceanside Boulevard, and a local air quality impact assessment that looks at both CO and particulate concentrations needs to be provided.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-17	EIR/EIS, p 1-2	Congestion from I-5 spills over to Coast Highway and to El Camino Real	No analysis is presented in the Air Quality Analysis (AQA) of what the air quality impacts or benefits of the I-5 widening will be to Coast Highway and El Camino Real. Clearly the I-5 widening will have a significant effect on the traffic on these roadways, but the resultant impact on air quality is not presented.	Fred Greve, MGA
AQ-18	EIR/EIS, p 2-4, and AQA pp 9 to 11	Modifications will be made to the interchanges with Mission Avenue, SR-76, and Harbor Drive	The interchange improvements will increase the traffic flowing in this area. Residences, at least one school, and other sensitive uses are located in the vicinity of these interchanges. First, these improvements will bring a higher level of traffic much closer to sensitive receptors, and a local air quality impact assessment needs to be conducted. Second, the interchange improvements will increase considerably the traffic that travels along roadways both east and west of the freeway. Homes and other sensitive receptors are located along these roadways, and a local air quality impact assessment that looks at both CO and particulate concentrations needs to be provided. Lastly, interchange improvements often involve extensive construction. Since these interchanges are located close to sensitive receptors, a local air quality analysis needs to be provided to determine the impacts during construction.	Fred Greve, MGA

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Scope and Content of the DEIR / EIS		
Overall comment	Inadequate for the purpose of NEPA and CEQA assessment and lacks required components of an environmental document.	Both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provide recommendations for format and content guidelines (CEQ Sec. 1502.10 and State CEQA Guidelines §§15120-15125). It appears that neither of these procedural and policy driven Acts have been adhered to thus rendering the DEIR/EIS inadequate to satisfy the NEPA and CEQA requirements. • The Summary section is incomplete. • Chapter 1 – Proposed Project is simply dismissive in providing information on a proposed action. Because there is no mention of a "main" project, the conclusion to provide "alternatives" is unsupported. The intention of providing a proposed action is to allow for full disclosure of potentially significant adverse impacts of its proposed project; and only once resource impacts are concluded can an analysis of potential alternatives be derived. • Chapter 2 – Project Alternatives fails to describe each alternative and its potential environmental impacts on resources.
Overall comment	Poorly structured document	The resource chapters 3.1 through 3.25 are poorly set up and analyzed rendering the environmental assessment unintelligible and not on par with accepted standards of practice. For example, Chapter 3.1 Land Use is subcategorized: 3.1.1 Existing and Future Land Use; 3.1.2 Consistency with State, Regional and Local Plans and Programs; and 3.1.3. Park and Recreational Facilities. And further broken down by the Affected Environment or Regulatory Setting, and/or Environmental Consequences, and lastly Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures. The Affected Environment provides a summary of the General Plan and City statistics. The Environmental Consequences states

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		there are no construction related impacts yet does not provide substantiated analysis to support these conclusions. There is no mention of operational impacts. No discussion of avoidance measures, minimizing plans or mitigation measures, although land use impacts are mentioned to result from "shifting' of land uses from residential to transportation, as well as to open space. Acknowledged short-term impacts are simply dismissed. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to provide for meaningful pubic review while adhering to the regulations of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall comment	Incorporation by Reference	Pursuant to NEPA, the use of Incorporation by Reference is permitted to cut down on bulk of an EIS when it does not impede review by an agency of the public; whereas, incorporated material is to be cited and its content briefly described. As such, the referencing material also needs to be reasonably available (CEQ §1502.21). State CEQA Guidelines §15150(c) states: "Where an EIR or Negative Declaration uses incorporation by reference, the incorporated part of the referenced document shall be briefly summarized where possible or briefly described if the data or information cannot be summarized. The relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the EIR shall be described." And further, subsection (f) states: "Incorporation by reference is most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background but do not contribute directly to the analysis of the problem at hand." As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the document does not provide citation in the body of the analysis and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The City herby requests any and all technical studies used in the preparation of the DEIR/EIS.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		The DEIR/EIS fails to provide for meaningful public review and comment, and for full disclosure in the decision making process due to the lack of citation (general or otherwise) referencing technical studies. No technical studies have been made available in the DEIR/EIS Appendix, which is considered the standard of practice when preparing an EIS or EIR. In addition, the project website does not list all technical studies stated for use the preparation of the DEIR/EIS. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. All technical studies prepared for the project, or referenced to be used in the analysis of the DEIR/EIS should be made available to the public either by additional appendices or noticed and posted on the project website.
Overall comment	Caltrans Corridor System Management Plan	The Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) is briefly described in one paragraph within the Summary (page S-1), and again on page 1-11 under Section 1.5 Other I-5 Considerations. However this plan is not stated to be incorporated by reference (CEQ §1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150(c)), nor does this plan appear to be analyzed in the environmental assessment. It is unclear to the City how a document such as the CSMP can be overlooked when discussing and analyzing potential environmental impacts, as the main purpose of a the *CSMP is to provide one unified concept for managing, operating, improving, and preserving a corridor across all modes and jurisdictions for highest productivity, mobility, reliability, accessibility, safety and preservation outcomes* (page S-1).
Overall Comment	Methodology Relied Upon For Environmental Assessment	NEPA requires an EIS to identify the methodologies used and explicit references to scientific and other sources relied upon for conclusion in the document (CEQ 1502.24). The DEIR/EIS fails to state the methodologies used in preparation of the document. For example, field surveys, literature research, and consultation with resource agencies are methodologies generally accepted standards of

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		practice. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Overall Comment	Identification of Potential Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impact	In preparing an EIR, the standard accepted practice among EIR preparers is to list each impact and then describe the mitigation measures intended to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for each impact, followed by a brief discussion of the level of significance after implementation of the mitigation measures (the residual impact). The DEIR/EIS fails to identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4). On this account, the document is fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature which precludes meaningful public review and comment.
Overall Comment	Level of Significance	Because the DEIR/EIS fails to state the level of significance of a potential impact, both before and after mitigation is implemented, the environmental analysis contained within this document is fundamentally inadequate for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act. In addition, the document fails to provide criteria for impact thresholds for which an assessment would be made (State CEQA Guidelines §15064.7). The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Overall Comment	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	This subheading within the subchapters of Chapter 3.0 for the Human Environment and Biological Environment should be revised in a numbered format or bullet points to clearly outline the mitigation program for the project. As currently written, it is unclear as to what the mitigation actually consists of. In addition, passive language such as "could" and "wherever possible" should be revised to more directive language such as "shall" so that mitigation is enforceable as required by CEQA.
Overall Comment	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	This subheading for mitigation measures is required to demonstrate how the measure is "roughly proportional" to the impacts of the project. As the DEIR/EIS is currently written, this component is in adequate for the purposes of CEQA.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Overall Comment	Residual Impact [Level of Impact after Implementation of Mitigation Measures]	The DEIR/EIS fails to state the level of impact after implementation of *Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures.* Without determining if a residual impact would occur, the cumulative impact(s) of the project cannot be properly assessed. This is required in determining project impacts for CEQA findings, approval, and statement of overriding considerations. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Overall comment	Impacted Parcels Incomplete and missing data	This is a critical component of assessing the project impacts and relevant to the requirements of NEPA and CEQA for full public disclosure. However, only after this information was requested, was the City was provided with a table of impacted parcels. This information must be included in the revised EIR/EIS to support compete public review. The Potential Parcels Impacts table is flawed. The table omits information accounting for a description of the existing land use or zoning. Without this information, an accurate assessment of potential impacts to land use, aesthetics, growth, environmental justice, and recreation cannot be assumed. The table does not offer a complete address in many cases. The table should have a corresponding exhibit clearly labeling each property propose to be acquired by the Caltrans project. In addition, the table is not consistent with the land use impact chapter; whereas this table lists 84 parcels and affected parcels based on temporary construction easements, retaining wall footing easements, slope easements, full parcel acquisition, and partial acquisition, yet does not provide impact assessment of project implementation of these actions. Also, while listing 84 parcels, the table omits information regarding how many of these impacted parcels are in fact multiple family units whereas more than 84 families or businesses will be directly affect by the project Further, this table demonstrates the minimum impact based on the

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		(narrowest) 8+4 buffer alternative whereas the 10+4 barrier will have the greatest impacts. The table is not mentioned in the Environmental Justice subchapter nor the Land Use Chapter(s). Discussion and analysis of partial and/or full acquisition of single-family homes, multiple-family residents, business and the like should be included in this chapter to review the effects on residents and landowners alike. Where required to do so, mitigation measures should be provided. The City requests a revised table that details the easements & acquisitions for all four scenarios. The easement will include: temporary construction, retaining wall, and slope easements. At a minimum, a revised table in including the 10+4 barrier scenario needs to be provided, so that we may notify our residents and business owners of potential implications from the project, and so that we can fully assess the project impacts on land use, community, growth, and EJ. The omission of this information in the DEIR/EIS clearly demonstrates an inadequate environmental document as key issues/impacts pertaining to land acquisition are neglected. This table should be revised to include this information and included in a re-circulated DEIR/EIS to allow for meaningful public review and comment.
General Comment	DEIR/EIS Cover Page *SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA* *11 – SD – 5 – KP* *R45.7/R89.1* *(PM R28.4/R55.4)* *EA 235800*	The cover page lists various numbers, including EA 235800. Does this number represent an Environmental Assessment prepared or referenced for the project?
General Comment	Three or four phases of construction and the use of a Project EIR, rather than a	Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines § 15165: *Where individual projects are, or a phased project is, to be undertaken and where the total undertaking comprises a project with significant environmental effect, the Lead Agency*

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Program EIR or Staged EIR.	*shall prepare a single program EIR for the ultimate project as described in Section 15168. Where an individual project is a necessary precedent for action on a larger project, or commits the Lead Agency to a larger project, with significant environmental effect, an EIR must address itself to the scope of the larger project. Where one project is one of several similar projects of a public agency, but is not deemed a part of a larger undertaking or a larger project, the agency may prepare one EIR for all projects, or one for each project, but shall in either case comment upon the cumulative effect.* As designed, the project is planned to be constructed over three (3) phases lasting in duration of ~40 years commencing Phase 1 2012-2020 / Phase 2 2021-2035 / Phase 3 2036-2050 (page 2-13). And yet, the Community Impact Assessment Report [relied upon for chapters 3.1 Land Use, 3.2 Growth, and 3.4 Community Impacts] states: "*Construction of the proposed alternatives would take place in four phases*" (Page 3-1) and is based on segments not predetermined dates. Based on this information, a Program EIR and/or Staged EIR is a more appropriate environmental document to adequately assess the potential impacts associated with the long-term project which also requires various discretionary approval by multiple cities and resource agencies (State CEQA Guidelines Article 11. Types of EIRs).
Appendices	Failure to include "Technical Studies" in the DEIR/EIS	The list of "Appendices" in the document should be revised to include all "Technical Studies" that are referenced in the DEIR/EIS on Page 3.3-1. These technical studies are in fact essential to the DEIR/EIS as they are the basis of the background, setting and impact analysis and conclusions of the DEIR/EIS. Incorporating them by reference is inadequate for purpose of full public disclosure.
Technical Studies	"Technical Studies"	The "Technical Studies" listed on page 3.1-1 differ from those on the Caltrans project website http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/Env_docs/I-5NCCTechStudies.html and differ from those listed in the individual Chapter 3 subsections (3.1 through 3.24).

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Technical Studies	"Technical Studies"	Caltrans has added new technical studies to the project website on August 2 and August 6. Adding additional review materials two months after the start of the public review and comment period is unheard of and the public comment period should be extended by two months to allow adequate review time of these newly available technical reference documents. It is unclear if these are intended to be "incorporated by reference" as some of the other studies are? This should be clarified in a recirculated DEIR/EIS.
NOP and NOI	NOP and NOI	Caltrans issued the NOP and NOI for the project in 2004. The DEIR/EIS is silent on the base year that is assumed for the description of the environmental setting and the basis for impact determinations.
Project Need	Need for project not demonstrated	The project is designed based on outdated SANDAG regional growth and population forecasts which occurred prior to the Smart Growth Initiative and AB 32 which established greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets. In February 2010, SANDAG adopted new growth forecasts through the project build out year 2050. Caltrans must revise and recirculate the DEIR/EIS so that it is in line with slower regional growth rates and associated reduced regional ADT.
Project Website DEIR/EIS Page i	Non-functioning website	Page i of the DEIR/EIS states: *Please read this Draft EIR/EIS. This document and the technical studies are available for review at* *http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/I-5-intro.html* However, this link is not functioning which impedes the public review process.
Land Acquisitions and Easements	--	Has the project proponent properly notified the land owners and occupants of the proposed project?
Table of Contents		
Overall comment	Lack of Technical Studies / Incorporated by Reference	On page 3.1-1 of the DEIR/EIS, a list of technical studies "prepared in support of this Draft EIR/EIS" and stated to be incorporated by reference; however, Appendices A-H do not these referenced include technical

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		studies. Please note: NEPA requires that referencing material be reasonably available (CEQ §1502.21); while CEQA allows for incorporation by reference only when the documents are made available to the public at a public place and is required to state where such place. The DEIR/EIS erroneously omits this information on said page, and within the Reference Chapter. This is a violation of full public disclosure which is intended to provide for meaningful evaluation of the DEIR/EIS. In addition, incorporation by reference is most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background but do not contribute directly to the analysis of the problem at hand (State CEQA Guidelines §15150).
Summary		
Overall comment	Summary Requirements	The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Summary section to include major conclusion, areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved. The DEIR/EIS fails to adhere to these basic requirements of NEPA and is rendered deficient. (CEQ Sec. 1502.12)
Overall comment	Summary Requirements	The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Summary section to include a brief summary of the proposed actions and consequences (State CEQA Guidelines §15123(a)). This section disregards this requirement. The DEIR/EIS fails to provide a "Proposed Project" or "Proposed Action".
Overall comment	Summary Requirements	CEQA requires the Summary section to include each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures (§15123 (b)(1)), Areas of Controversy (§15123 (b)(2)), and Issues to be Resolved, including the choice among alternatives and how to mitigate the significant impacts(§15123)(b)(3)). As written, the DEIR/EIS does not identify these requirements.
Overall comment	Lack of Proposed Project	The Summary section lacks a discussion of the Proposed Project, and rather provides four Project Alternatives and a No Project. Pursuant to State

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, the EIR must describe a range of alternative to the proposed project which would feasibly attain most of the objectives of the Proposed Project while evaluating the comparative merits of the alternatives. This is a fundamental mistake in the DEIR and must be clarified prior to release of a recirculated DEIR/EIS. As a Cooperating and Responsible Agency, the City finds that this DEIR/EIS does not provide a meaningful public disclosure. Failure to comply with this substantive requirement of NEPA and CEQA renders the DEIR/EIS inadequate for the decision-making process.
Overall comment	Baseline Environment	Because the NOI and NOP were circulated six (6) years ago, please clarify the when the baseline of the physical environment was established as it pertains to the NEPA and CEQA analysis.
Page S-1	Section S.2 Purpose and Need *The objectives of the project are to:* • *Maintain or improve future traffic levels of service in 2030 over the existing levels of service;* • *Maintain or improve travel times within the corridor;* • *Provide a facility that is compatible with future bus rapid transit and other modal options;* • *Provide consistency with the regional transportation plan, San Diego Regional Transportation Plan:*	The Purpose and Need Statement reflects a build out year of 2030 yet the project will not be complete and fully operational until 2050 assuming funding is secured for the project. Therefore, the project itself would not obtain the basic stated goals and objectives included in the DEIR/EIS. Additionally, as defined, none of the alternatives proposed would attain this primary goal of the project. The preferred project needs to be stated, the goals and objectives re-evaluated, and the DEIR/EIS recirculated for meaningful public review. The alternatives should be developed in response to the need to avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant impacts of the project.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP) where feasible and in compliance with federal and state regulations; *• Maintain the facility as an effective link in the national Strategic Highway Network; and* *• Protect and/or enhance the human and natural environment along the I-5 corridor. Project Purpose and Need*	
Page S-1	Project Goals and Objectives	In light of SANDAG preparing a new RTP that will soon be complete and will be based on revised 2050 population growth forecasts (adopted by this MPO in February 2010), it is imperative that Caltrans and FHWA coordinate with SANDAG to ensure that any and all regional roadway improvement projects proposed by Caltrans are consistent with regional growth forecasts for travel demand and average daily trip forecasts. Because growth will occur and a slower rate than previously anticipated, the City is concerned that Caltrans is relaying on outdated growth forecasts, which will result in an overbuilt project that substantially exceeds demand based on the new and more current ADT projections. The DEIR/EIS must be revised in light of this new significant information and recirculated pursuant to 2010 State CEQA Guidelines §15088.5.
Page S-2	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative	The DEIR/EIS fails to identify the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative" as is required by NEPA. CEQA also requires the identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative (2010 State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(e)(2). Because the DEIR/EIS fails to comply with this requirement of NEPA and CEQA, the document must be revised and recirculated for meaningful public review.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page S-4 3rd paragraph	NEPA / CEQA Scoping	The DEIR/EIS states scoping meetings were held prior to the circulation of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in January 2004, and circulation the Notice of Preparation (NOP) in October 2004; which is more than six (6) years ago. However, Chapter 5 states that scoping meetings were held in 2001, 2004, and 2006. Please explain this discrepancy. The Summary Chapter must provide detailed information regarding the Scoping Process, Consultation, or Coordination. Please provide the dates, locations, public notices and brief summary from each scoping meeting and the scoping process. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §21083.9, the project proponent is required to provide scoping meetings for projects of statewide, regional, or areawide significance, as well as, notification of scoping meetings to a responsible agency. In addition, SB 947 (Hollingsworth) requires notice of at least one scoping meeting to be provided to transportation planning agencies or public agencies required to be consulted concerning such a project, and will require the project's effect on overpasses, on-ramps, and off-ramps to be included in that consultation.
Page S-5	Table S.1 Summary of Major Potential Impacts from Alternatives	This table is inconsistent with regards to the analysis contained within the resource chapters, and at best, utilizes inadequate assessment practices. For example, to state there would be "Minor inconsistencies with city and community plans" to Land Use impacts is inaccurate, as the City of Oceanside <u>alone</u> would be affected by easements and/or land acquisitions totaling 84 parcels [it is assumed many of these parcels are multifamily units, therefore accounting for more than 84 families, individuals or businesses being affected]. This comment refers to back to the DEIR/EIS deficiencies regarding lack of threshold for assessing project impacts, and criteria for defining a potential impact.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		This table should be revised after all comments are responded to, so that it encompasses all potential project impacts, and where new information is provided and leading to the need for a revised and recirculated DEIR/EIS.
Page S-7	Table S.2 Permits and Approvals Needed	This table states that a Freeway Agreement for Oceanside Boulevard direct access agreement (DAR) will be required with the City of Oceanside. The DEIR/EIS must also reference City of Oceanside Municipal Code section 2.81 which prohibits the sale or lease of City property used for park and recreational purposes without approval of the voters. Caltrans will need to comply with this code section for land needed in the City's Goat Hill area. In addition, under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) the City of Oceanside is requesting formal designation as a Cooperating Agency (CEQ 1501.6 & 1508.5) and Responsible Agency (15096 & 15381) under CEQA. As such, the project will be required to adhere to federal and State environmental acts, regulations, and guidelines regarding the potential impacts to the City, including its residents, business owners, and visitors.
Page S-8	Section S.7 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	The organization of this section and subsequent subsections does not explain which bullet points are mitigation measures and for what impacts are they are intended to offset or avoid. The listed subsection titles (i.e., Relocations and Natural Communities) do not exist in the Table of Contents, while other subsections (i.e., Hydrology and Floodplains) are analyzed and described under different subsection categories throughout the DEIR/EIS. This section must be re-written to describe the specific impact followed by mitigation and/or project design features.
Page S-15 1st paragraph	Loma Alta Creek. *Loma Alta Creek is a highly disturbed and constricted creek that flows parallel to Oceanside Boulevard in a developed portion of Oceanside… There may be an opportunity in this*	When, and under what criteria, would this action take place? The DEIR/EIS must be revised to clearly address these impacts and mitigation measures.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	portion of the creek to enhance the wetland habitat and water quality before the water empties into the Pacific Ocean.	
Page S-15 2nd paragraph	San Luis Rey River. *The San Luis Rey River near I-5 is a large open water channel with primarily freshwater marsh and arundo scrub along the banks. Two projects proposed for the area, Coast Highway Seismic Retrofit and the Pacific Street Bridge have already proposed restoration of wetlands along the banks of the river through the removal of exotic species and revegetation with natives. Mitigation for impacts at the San Luis Rey River would be completed by debiting credits from the Pilgrim Creek Mitigation Bank.*	What are the potential impacts to the San Luis Rey River? Irrespective of additional projects having an impact on the river, the project will need to provide mitigation to offset or reduce impacts associated with the I-5 project (State CEQA Guidelines §§15021, 15091, 15370, and 15126.4), as well as consider the cumulative effects on the river from the additional projects. Proposed restoration from impacts of another project are not sufficient in addressing the potential impacts of this project, nor do they excuse this project in providing mitigation for additional direct and cumulative impacts to the environment.
Page S-16	Section S.8 Other Projects and Considerations	The DEIR/EIS is unclear if the four (4) listed projects are provided as the basis for baseline environmental analysis or cumulative projects.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Please refer to the City's list of related projects which has provided in an attachment to our cover letter for a complete list of projects that must be assessed under the cumulative analysis in the revised DEIR/EIS.
Chapter 1.0 Proposed Project		
Page 1-1 2nd paragraph	*The proposed project improvements include one or two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) / Managed Lanes (ML) in each direction, auxiliary lanes where needed, and possibly one general-purpose lane in each direction.*	The DEIR/EIS fails to provide a specified "Proposed Project" or "Proposed Action". It is unclear if this statement is the specific project or a generalization of the four (4) alternatives. This is a fundamental mistake of the DEIR/EIS. As a Cooperating and Responsible Agency, the City finds that this DEIR/EIS does not provide a meaningful public disclosure. Failure to comply with this substantive requirement of NEPA and CEQA renders the DEIR/EIS inadequate for use by the City in its decision-making process.
Overall comment	Lack of Intended Uses	The DEIR/EIS fails to provide a statement describing the intended uses of the document (State CEQA Guidelines §15124 (d)).
Overall comment	Overuse of Technical Information and Lack of Referenced Material	This chapter provides highly technical information yet omits how such analysis was concluded or from what source may reference. A few examples are the discussions under the headings: Annual Average Daily Use, Weaving Analysis, Weekend Use and HOV Use. Both NEPA and CEQA require an EIS or EIR (respectively) to be written in plain language so that decision makers and the public can readily understand them. (CEQ Sec. 1502.8) (State CEQA Guidelines §15140).
Overall comment	Baseline Environment	No description of the baseline environment provided. Both NEPA and CEQA require the description of a baseline and/or affected environment. Without providing a description of the baseline environment, the analysis provided is considered unsubstantiated for the purposes of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall comment	Areas of be affected by project construction and project implementation	Although the DEIR/EIS provides a start and stopping point for the major transportation improvements, no project boundary along the west and east sides of Interstate 5 are provided. Changing from an eight (8) lane freeway to a potential 12 or 14 lane freeway has significant implications which can

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		only be assessed when a physical boundary is provided. In addition no discussion of local roadway impacts is provided. It can be reasonably assumed that with long-term interstate projects, many drivers will elect to drive surface roads to avoid construction routing and delays. This assessment needs to be added into the DEIR/EIS and recirculated.
Overall Comment	Scope of Project	The northern terminus of the project is stated to be near [Oceanside] Harbor Drive in Oceanside. However, the DEIR/EIS fails to address each on-ramp, off-ramp, and/or bridge which may be affected within the City of Oceanside, other than mentioning the direct access ramp at Oceanside Boulevard. To assess the full level of potential impacts from project implementation, the DEIR/EIS should be revised to list/discuss all overpasses, bridges and off- and on-ramps, including all improvements to the transportation system within City boundaries.
Chapter 2.0 Project Alternatives		
Overall Comment	Choice of Alternatives	Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, the lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. Please revise the DEIR/EIS to disclose this information.
General Comment	Mass Transit and Alternative Transportation	The DEIR/EIS fails to analyze a mass transit and alternative modes of transportation alternative, and its resultant effects on significant noise, carbon emissions, traffic, and air quality in and around the project area. The City believes this reasonable alternative may accomplish the project objectives and is pertinent to the State's goals regarding Assembly Bill 32 and State Bill 375. Whereas, the State is required by the Governors Order to reduce emissions below 1990 levels, and yet the project alternatives fail to study alternatives that will reduce carbon emissions towards achieving

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		this goal.
Overall comment	No preferred project alternative identified	NEPA requires the discussion and analysis of the proposed action and the alternatives in a comparative form. This is the "heart of the environmental impact statement" (CEQ Sec. 1502.12). In this section agencies shall: (a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated. (b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits. (c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. (d) Include the alternative of no action. (e) Identify the agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference. (f) Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives. By providing a comparative analysis, a preferred alternative can be concluded.
Overall comment	No preferred project alternative identified	CEQA requires consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed project. The identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives is required; whereas "The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly" and "If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives" (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6).
Page 2-1	Right-of-Way	The DEIR/EIS fails to provide a complete listing of properties which may be subject to right-of-way property loss. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include this impact table to provide information relevant in assessing potential impacts to land use, growth and community impacts, and environmental justice.
Page 2-1 and Page 2-5	Utility Reconnections	The DEIR/EIS fails to provide a listing of which utility reconnection would be necessary and level of significance for each disconnection. Page 2-5 lists two streets, yet does not provide enough detail such as on-ramp or off-ramp, or direction. The DEIR/EIS is deficient in providing enough information for an accurate environmental analysis.
Figure 2.2-14 m-p	Figures inadequate	The figures included in this chapter of the DEIR/EIS are inadequate for purposes of full public disclosure. The scale of the figures makes it impossible to understand where the take of property would occur. The impact cannot be understood at this scale. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include larger and better maps so that property owners who are affected by the project can understand the full size and magnitude of the impact.
Page 2-1	*This section describes the proposed action [underscore added] and the design alternatives that were developed by a multidisciplinary team to achieve the project purpose and need while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts.*	This statement is does not accurately reflect this section. Nowhere in this section, nor in the previous section titled "Proposed Project", is there information and description of a "main" or preferred project. Without a Proposed Project or Proposed Action the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy both NEPA and CEQA requirements for a full disclosure examination of potentially significant impacts.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Table 2.2	Structure Replacements and Widening	This table does not provide data regarding a Proposed Project or Proposed Action, only five (5) alternatives. Further this table does not provide measurements for widening of height of proposed bridges or design features.
Page 2-5	Section 2.2.1 Build Alternatives	This section does not satisfy the requirements of NEPA; whereas, the DEIR/EIS must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives along with the proposed action. Reasonable alternatives are those that may be feasibly carried out based on technical, economic, environmental and other factors. An alternative in not infeasible merely because the project proponent does not like it. (CEQ 1502.14)
Page 2-8	Community Enhancement Projects	The DEIR/EIS lists nine (9) projects (elsewhere referred to as opportunities) which are *considered "candidates for inclusion" in the project's final design and may or may not all be implemented, as this would be dependent on each local agency agreeing to maintain them in perpetuity*. It is unclear if the enhancement projects are considered a proposed action, included as project alternatives, or future projects subject to future environmental consideration. These project and their actions will need further analysis.
Page 2-13	Phased Construction	The phased construction section does not differentiate between any of the project alternatives. It is easily concluded that a variance in timing and cost would occur based on four (4) alternatives. Please update and revise.
Page 2-13 1st paragraph	*The current 2030 RTP includes 2 HOV lanes from La Jolla Village Drive to the I-5/I-805 Merge and 4 Managed lanes from I-5/I-805 Merge to Cannon Road to be built by 2014, <u>and 4 Managed lanes from Cannon Road to Vandegrift Blvd. to be built by 2030</u> [underscore added]. The I-5 NCC Project phasing will be consistent with 2050, RTP*	Project construction in Oceanside is expected to occur from 2014-2030 based on the DEIR/EIS statement. Is this an accurate assumption when Phase 3 is expected in 2036-2050? Please resolve this discrepancy. Where necessary please revise Figures 2-2.3 through 2-2.5. How is the project need and phasing planned to be *consistent* with the 2050 RTP? How is that relevant to the DEIR/EIS

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	currently scheduled for adoption in 2011.	
Table 2.3	Permits and Approvals Needed	(see prior comment under the Summary heading) Within this table, the City of Oceanside is stated to approve/permit the Freeway Agreement for Oceanside Boulevard DAR. In addition, the project must comply with City of Oceanside Municipal Code section 2.81 which prohibits the sale or lease of City property used for park and recreational purposes without approval of the voters. Under NEPA, the City is a Cooperating Agency. Under CEQA, the City is a Responsible Agency. This information must be included in this table and included in the revised EIR/EIS.
Section 2.2.1 Common Design Features of the Build Alternatives and Table 2.1 Interchange/Ramp Reconfiguration	These two referenced sections provide conflicting information.	In the table, the Oceanside Boulevard Interchange is stated to only affect the southbound ramp; however, the text states direct access ramps would be constructed to accommodate northbound and southbound traffic. Please revise this section and the analysis, and recirculate the DEIR/EIS as required.
Page 2-22	Figure 2-2.9: Schematic for 8+4 Buffer Alternative	This figure needs to be revised to demonstrate all on- and off-ramps and bridges within City limit, and which will be affected by project implementation. As currently portrayed, this figure is not accurate and inadequate for the purposes of a complete environmental review.
Page 2-62	Figure 2-2.14ai Project Features Map: 10+4 Buffer Alternative	This figure does not display a noise barrier wall north of Cassidy along Soto Street. Is this accurate? If so why is no barrier provided?
Page 2-64	Figure 2-2.14ak Project Features Map: 10+4 Buffer Alternative	This figure does not accurately demonstrate the proposed direct access ramp at Oceanside Boulevard. Please revise and recirculate.
Page 2-65	Figure 2-2.14al Project Features Map:	Are the proposed modifications, including two signal lights, overcrossing and other unstated improvements, to Mission Avenue analyzed within the

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	10+4 Buffer Alternative	DEIR/EIS? What are the impacts to the local roadways?
Page 2-67	Figure 2-2.14an Project Features Map: 10+4 Buffer Alternative	This figure does not appear to provide structures or improvements demonstrating the intermediate access points. Please revise and recirculate.
Chapter 3.1 Land Use		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Land Use section does not provide analysis of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. Conclusionary statements such as the project consistency findings listed in Table 3.1.1: Project Consistency with Local Plans and Policies as "All four alternatives would be consistent. No Build Alternative would be consistent." are not supported by any sufficient assessment. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS do not allow for a meaningful evaluation by the public, responsible Agencies or the decision makers. The errors throughout the DEIR/EIS render the NEPA/CEQA document inadequate for decision makers to determine the significance of impacts and adequacy of mitigation.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Land Use section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis so that the reader can understand the criteria against which environmental impacts are evaluated. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas "...would have a less than significant effect on the environment"; however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Overall Comment	Oceanside Potential Impacted Parcels Table	The Oceanside Potential Impacted Parcels Table was omitted from the DEIR/EIS and must be included in the revised DEIR/EIS for compete disclosure of impacts. The City will in fact be directly affected by project implementation as the I-5 transects the City in a north/south fashion. In addition, the City is both a Cooperating Agency and Responsible Agency

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		(NEPA and CEQA, respectively); and as such, should have been provided with this pertinent information not only for the general acknowledgement of potential impacts to its residents and visitors in assessing potential land use and environmental justice impacts, but as a professional courtesy to effected Cities, as well. This table would be better understood with a usable exhibit to demonstrate the potentially affected parcels based on the various easements and land acquisitions the project is proposing. The scale of the exhibits provided in the DEIR./EIS renders the table useless. This table (and versions of this table for other affected Cities) needs to be included in the land use analysis to correctly asses the impacts of the project on the surrounding land parcels. Without doing so (as is the case presently), the impact analysis is not only inadequate but flawed for the purposes of NEPA and CEQA for full public disclosure. Where required to do so, the project should provide mitigation measures for significant impacts. See comment above regarding this table in the Overall Scope, Content and Organization of the DEIR/EIS section.
Page 3.1-4	Figure 3-1.1 Study Area Communities	This figure does not demonstrate all off- and on-ramps within the City.
Page 3.1-13 13th paragraph	*There are no proposed/planned projects (representing land use changes) located near the proposed project within Oceanside.*	This statement is incorrect. Proposed and planned projects are only one consideration while land use modifications are another consideration for potential impacts and necessary to assess project impacts as well as cumulative impacts. The DEIR/EIS preparers should have consulted with City of Oceanside staff for a listing of the proposed projects located near I-5. Please see list provided in cover letter which demonstrates active and approved projects within the City boundary.
Page 3.1-17	*Though land uses in specific parcels would shift from residential to*	This statement is erroneous. The direct loss of any residential units is a significant adverse environmental impact of the project.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	transportation, existing land use patterns in the community would not be affected, and no adverse land use impacts are anticipated.	The modification of existing and/or planned residential land to a non-residential land use is in fact an impact which requires mitigation under CEQA.
Page 3.1-18 3rd paragraph 8th paragraph	*As discussed above implementation of the 10+4 with Barrier would result in impacts to residential, commercial, agricultural, undeveloped, recreational, and roadway land uses. Land use patterns, development trends or proposed land uses would not shift outside of the affected parcels displaced.* *The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to land use. No mitigation measures are required. Caltrans has undertaken efforts to integrate the proposed project with the adjacent and/or adjoining communities. In addition to the www.keepsandiegomoving.com website, Caltrans has been available for*	These two statements are contradictory and must be re-evaluated. Similar statements reflecting differing opinion without substantiated evidence or analysis are found throughout this section. The DEIR/EIS must be re-written and re-circulated for meaningful public review and full disclosure of an informational document.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	community meetings to provide the community information about the proposed project.	
Page 3.1-16 1st paragraph	Section 3.1.1.2 Environmental Consequences *Construction-related impacts would be similar for all four alternatives.*	The statement "Construction-related impacts would be similar for all four alternatives" is not adequate for the purposes of NEPA or CEQA. NEPA requires the detailed analysis of each alternative as required by the project action analysis; whereas CEQA requires sufficient discussion of alternatives to allow for meaningful analysis. Without this information, no comparison of alternatives can be made and no environmentally superior alternative can be identified. No discussion of operational-related impacts is provided. No discussion of construction-related or operational-related impacts to a Proposed Project or Proposed Action is provided. The DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly.
Page 3.1-21	Consistency analysis with State, Regional and Local Plans and Programs	No discussion or assessment of local zoning designations is provided. The DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly.
Page 3.1-22 7th paragraph	Section 3.1.2.2 Environmental Consequences *Construction activities may create conflicts with relevant existing plans and programs by disrupting vehicular and pedestrian access, increasing noise, dust, and harmful emissions, creating visual*	Environmental impacts, whether "short-term" or "long-term", are still environmental impacts particularly in the case of this project where construction would occur over decades As such, mitigation measures are required to offset or reduce land use impacts. State CEQA Guidelines §15126 requires that an EIR consider all phases of the project when evaluating environmental impacts. As currently written the DEIR/EIS is not adequate for the purpose of full public disclosure and meaningful pubic review. The DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	impacts, and using parking lots and vacant areas as staging grounds for construction activities. However, any impacts related to these disruptions are considered temporary proximity impacts and are not anticipated to result in permanent conflicts with relevant existing plans and programs.	
Page 3.1-22 5th paragraph	*Implementation of the proposed project would not require acquisitions of any land within Batiquitos Lagoon or Buena Vista Lagoon, nor would it impact any recreational activities at either of the lagoons. Therefore, land use plans pertaining to these specific lagoons were not evaluated for policy consistency since the proposed project would not be affected by any aspects of the management plans.*	The DEIR/EIS fails to provide an analysis to support this statement; when in fact project construction, staging and operations may affect the Buena Vista Lagoon. The DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly and the project's compliance with the policies and goals of this document analyzed in a recirculated document.
Page 3.1-24 8th and 9th paragraph	Consistency with conclusions	The DEIR/EIS acknowledges that "The proposed project would convert residential and commercial land uses to transportation uses…" and that "…impacts would be restricted to isolated parcels along an existing transportation corridor…". In addition, the DEIR/EIS states "Encroachments into adjacent open space at Buena Vista Lagoon and along the San Luis

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Rey River would be minimized and measures incorporated to avoid indirect effects to water quality"; however this statement omits discussion on land use, open space, or recreational impacts. No assessment is provided, nor are any mitigation measures to offset or reduce the impacts to residential land uses, open space, or natural resources. Caltrans provided to the City of Oceanside a table that described by parcel number which properties would be directly affected by the various alternatives. The DEIR/EIS must be recirculated such that it includes this essential information.
Page 3.1-24 9th paragraph	*Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City of Oceanside General Plan.*	The analysis in the DEIR/EIS is incomplete and this blanket statement is not accurate and should be deleted from the DEIR/EIS.
Table 3.1.1: Project Consistency with Local Plans and Policies	*Project Considerations and Project Consistency*	This table omits any reference to the 84 parcels which will be impacted by the project. This omission alone renders the DEIR/EIS inadequate for the purposed of a full disclosure document. Meaningful public review and subsequent decisionmaking is thwarted due to the lack of analysis of the 84 potential parcel impacts. The City requires discussion of these potential impacts and a meeting with Caltrans District 11 staff in the near term. The single page table provided by Caltrans to the City (and excluded from the DEIR/EIS) identifies 18 full acquisitions and 26 partial property takings which differs from the information provided by Caltrans during the project coordination meetings. In addition it is our understanding that actual acquisitions will not be known until addition design work is competed many years from now. This is a significant change and one that must be revised with the corrected information included in order to provide full disclosure and public review and comment opportunities.
Page 3.1-36 Table 3.1.1: Project Consistency	*Caltrans is not a land use planning agency, and therefore has no authority*	Please resolve the conflict between this statement and the project's intent to modify existing residential land use (among others) to transportation uses.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
with Local Plans and Policies	*on land use designation or limiting incompatible land uses adjacent to a highway.*	
Page 3.1-36 Table 3.1.1: Project Consistency with Local Plans and Policies	*Caltrans proposes to construct noise barriers at various locations along the I-5 corridor, where feasible and reasonable, to abate for highway traffic noise; the location, height, materials, and other design features are discussed in Section 3-15.3.*	If the increased noise levels are not controlled by noise barriers which *may or may not* be built, then noise impacts would be in fact remain significant and unavoidable. The DEIR/EIS must e revised and recirculated to address these impacts with certainty.
Page 3.1-42 3.1.2.3 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures heading	*As discussed previously, the PWP/TREP recommends measures to achieve consistency with the CMZA, California Coastal Act, and the LCPs. The TREP/PWP would provide an implementation mechanism to address improvements throughout the corridor as a system that would avoid or offset impacts while focusing on protecting, enhancing, and maintaining coastal resource values, and maximizing public access to coastal resources and recreational facilities.*	No mitigation measures or project design features are listed here. Both NEPA and CEQA require the identification of impacts. CEQA also requires the inclusion of mitigation measures to offset or reduce the impacts. The DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly to include a discussion of the impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after implementation after the mitigation program.
Page 3.1-45	*No mitigation measures are*	This section needs to be revised to include the referenced designed

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
6th paragraph	*required. However, the proposed project has been designed to minimize impacts, where possible, by reducing the amount of right-of-way and limiting the grading footprint to minimize impacts to natural resources while still meeting project objectives.*	features. The use of the term "where possible" suggests the potential impacts may in fact not be mitigated; which results in a significant impact. The determination that the project will not significantly impact land use is flawed on this basis and must be revised to incorporate State CEQA definition of a significant land use impact.
Chapter 3.2 Growth		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Growth section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use used for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Growth section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas "...would have a less than significant effect on the environment"; however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.2-2 Environmental Consequences	*Build Alternatives*	This section does not provide a thorough analysis of the project alternatives as required by NEPA. Rather this section lumps the discussion under the subheading "Build Alternatives" instead of discussing the potential impacts on each of the four (4) alternatives. This analysis is inadequate for the purpose of a meaningful environmental evaluation and must be rewritten.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page 3.2-3 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	As discussed above, growth within the project area would most likely occur without the proposed project or under any of the project alternatives.	The DEIR/EIS lacks analysis of a "proposed project" as one has not yet been defined by Caltrans. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and to identify which alternative Caltrans prefers.
Chapter 3.3 Farmlands / Agricultural Lands		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Farmlands/Agricultural Lands section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use used for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and must be recirculated to allow full public disclosure and review of project impacts.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Farmlands/Agricultural Lands section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas "...would have a less than significant effect on the environment"; however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Chapter 3.4 Community Impacts		

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Community Impacts section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use used for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and must be recirculated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Community Impacts section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis in a recirculated DEIR/EIS. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas "...would have a less than significant effect on the environment"; however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.4-3	3.4.1.3 Environmental Consequences	This section provides discussion on construction-related impacts for the 10+4 Barrier Alternative by City, then discusses the other alternatives without any reference to a City. At best, this section is unorganized and inadequate for the purpose of analyzing potential impacts. The section (and for other resource areas as well) omits analysis for operational impacts.
Page 3.4.3 11th paragraph	3.4.3.1 Environmental Consequences *Construction-related impacts to communities in the vicinity of the proposed project would potentially include periodic vehicular and pedestrian access*	The DEIR/EIS correctly identifies environmental impacts to various aspects of the community yet does not provide mitigation or other measures to reduce or offset the impacts. This section must be revised to describe mitigation intended to minimize impact (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4). In addition, construction impacts from a 30+ year project cannot be considered "temporary". Please delete this statement, and all statements similar to this in the DEIR/EIS, re-assess and recirculate.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	disruptions, increased noise, dust generation, reduced visual quality, and economic impacts. *… Any disruptions and impacts related to construction activities would be temporary.*	
Page 3.4-5 4th paragraph	*Most of the community enhancement features, If implemented, would occur in areas with high minority populations…*	This statement is under the heading Environmental Consequences. However, this statement follows the discussion of possible community features which have not been determined as a part of the project. More accurately this section should discuss the potential environmental consequences stemming from project implementation [as suggested in the heading]. Please revise to include this analysis. Further, the use of the term "if implemented" renders these statements subjective which provide no bearing on the environmental analysis. These statements must be deleted as they are uncertain outcomes of the project.
Page 3.4-5 5th paragraph	*The proposed project would also impact a portion of the Center City Golf Course, an 18-hole public golf course, but would not affect any of the activities, features, or attributes of the facility.*	Please clarify what the impact will be to the Center City Golf Course, and include the discussion under Section 3.1.3. Park and Recreational Facilities, as well.
Page 3.4-6 6th paragraph	3.4.1.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures *The following measures would help to minimize impacts to communities*	"Noting" traffic impacts in a TMP does not constitute actual mitigation measures because "noting" an impact does not have an actual effect on reducing or minimizing an impact. It is also unclear what this mitigation measure is intend to minimize in the first place. CEQA requires a nexus between the impact and mitigation (State CEQA Guidelines §§15041(a) and 15126.4).

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	during construction activities: • *Traffic impacts around schools would be noted in the Traffic Management Plan.*	
Page 3.4-8	Table 3.4.1: Relocation Associated with the 10+4 with Barrier Alternative	This table is inconsistent with the Potential Parcels Impacts table provided to the City. The table in the DEIR/EIS states 44 residential units and 3 businesses will be relocated; whereas the "Potential Impacted Parcels" table just recently provided to the City [half way into the review period] demonstrates 44 partial and full land acquisitions nut does not state if they are multi-family, single-family or businesses. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS and project materials render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirculated.
Pages 3.4-9 1st paragraph 2nd paragraph	3.4.2.3 Environmental Consequences *The 10+4 with Barrier Alternative would displace 13 single-family and 31 multi-family units in Oceanside. Nine of the single-family units are located in South Oceanside, with 3 single-family units and 31 multi-family units located in Townsite, and one single-*	The DEIR/EIS identifies impacts from project implementation making relocation necessary for the occupants of 44 residential units and 3 businesses. The reader is then referred to additional documents to review details of the displacements of Oceanside residents. The DEIR/EIS should be re-written to include the summary of the additional reports, in addition to acknowledgement of a significant and adverse land use impact to relocating 44 residential units and 3 businesses. In addition, the "Potential Impacted Parcels" table provided by Caltrans to the City is essential to understanding the impact analysis and should have been contained in the DEIR/EIS. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include the corrected information and recirculated to allow full disclosure and public review.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	family unit in East Side Capistrano. *Three businesses in Loma Alta would require relocation within Oceanside.* *While adequate relocation opportunities exist for two of these sites, it may be difficult to identify an appropriate relocation site for a specialty sports business….* *Therefore, relocation impacts are not anticipated to be adverse.*	
Chapter 3.7 Visual and Aesthetics		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Visual/Aesthesis section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirculated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Visual/Aesthesis section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
General Comment	Additional analysis required	Without providing conceptual drawing demonstrating the proposed noise walls along the I-5, a complete assessment of impacts cannot be achieved. Please provide visual simulations of the noise walls at the drivers' eye level for the Oceanside segment for analysis of significant view impacts to the coastal views and views noted in the Oceanside General Plan.
Page 3.7-2	Figure 3-7.1: Landscape Units Map (not to scale)	This table should be revised to include "to scale" measurements. There should be an accompanying geographic description of the various landscape units. On this figure some landscape units appear larger in spatial size, what is the reasoning for that?
Pages 3.7-10 - 3.7-11	Criteria for vividness, intactness, and unity	The use of the term "moderate" and "moderately high" are undefined as these terms relates to the assessment criteria of vividness, intactness, and unity. Please revise to include a scale or some other means to assess these criteria.
Pages 3.7-10 - 3.7-11	The viewshed boundaries are not stated.	Please define the boundaries of the various viewsheds referenced to be in or around the City of Oceanside (i.e., Buena Vista Lagoon, Loma Alta Creek, Oceanside Gateway, and San Luis River).
Page 3.7-15 4th paragraph	*Specific goals and policies contained in the general plans of other cities in the corridor reflect the community values expressed above.*	Please state the various City's goals and objectives for aesthetic sand viewscapes, and assess for project consistency.
Page 3.17-16	Figure 3-7.41: Key View Map	It appears Key Views #14, 15, 16 and 17 are relevant to the City of Oceanside. However the discussion for Key View 14 (page 3.7-13) appears to be the same discussion and photos depicted for Key View 12 in the City of Carlsbad, please reconcile. Similarly, Key View 15 while demonstrated to be within or near the City on the figure provides an assessment of viewscapes with Carlsbad.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Please clarify and re-assess potential aesthetic impacts.
Page 3.7-33	*Key View 16* *Change to Visual Quality/Character* *The change would be incompatible with the visual character of the adjacent surroundings.* *Resulting Visual Impact* *Change to visual quality and character would be high. Viewer response would be high. <u>The visual impact would be high.</u>* [emphasis added]	This City agrees with these statements which constitute significant adverse aesthetic impacts. Based on the DEIR/EIS conclusion, please explain how the Summary chapter concludes: "*Visual character of the corridor would become substantially more urban. Visual quality would be lowered substantially. One ocean view would be lost.*" Summary Chapter Table S.1: Summary of Major Potential Impacts by Alternative. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly. Proper acknowledgement of potential impacts would have revealed the need for more appropriate mitigation, and for examination of alternatives to avoid or reduce affected areas.
Page 3.7-33	*Key View #16* *Proposed Project Features* *Retaining walls up to 12.2 m (40 ft) in height in cut sections of the roadway would be located near the existing right-of-way and additional space at the base of the walls for landscaping would not be available. A noise wall 3.6 m (12 ft) in height would be located at the top of the*	Key View #16 in Oceanside would result in a 52 foot high wall and would significantly affect residents, local street users, and freeway travelers. This sentence should be revised to acknowledge this severe impact and the DEIR/EIS should be recirculated for public review to allow disclosure of this new significant adverse environmental impact.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	retaining wall on the southbound side of the freeway.	
Page 3.7-35	Key View #17 – Mission Avenue Interchange Summary of Visual Impacts *… a number of interchange/operations/adjacent projects would move forward independently from the I-5 NCC Project as described in Chapter 2.*	If this in fact is the case, please explain why Key View #17 - Mission Avenue Interchange is included in the DEIR/EIS analysis.
Page 3.7-35 1st paragraph	*Loss of Existing Views and Creation of a "Tunnel Effect"* *…In addition, the sense of enclosure created by the walls would be similar to the travel experience one now encounters in large urban areas to the north, thereby diminishing the region's unique visual identity.*	The City agrees that portions of the project will result in a 'tunneling effect'. This sentence should be revised to acknowledge this severe impact and the DEIR/EIS should be recirculated for public review to allow disclosure of this new significant adverse environmental impact.
Page 3.7-33	Figure 3-7.78: Visual Impact Summary Map	This figure is not consistent with the Figure 3-7.41: Key View Map or Figure 3-7.1: Landscape Units Map (not to scale). Whereas the assessment of impacts does not accurately portray the loss of ocean views, loss of view to resource, and impact to resource in addition to loss of desirable view (thus recreating the "tunnel vision"), and impact of the addition of large structures and walls. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly. Proper

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		acknowledgement of potential impacts would have revealed the need for more appropriate mitigation, and for examination of alternatives to avoid or reduce affected areas.
Page 3.7-35 9th paragraph	*At some freeway interchanges, the project may include new visual elements that would be incompatible with existing visual character.*	This sentence should be revised to acknowledge this severe impact and the DEIR/EIS should be recirculated for public review to allow disclosure of this new significant adverse environmental impact.
Page 3.7-36	Figure 3-7.78: Visual Impact Summary Map	This figure, while not to scale, states there will be *scenic resource impacts from loss of ocean view, loss of view to resource, and impacts to resource,* as well as, *freeway viewer impacts from loss of desirable view, larger walls or structures, and loss of mature trees* to the areas with the City boundary. In conflicting analysis the DEIR/EIS concludes in the Summary Chapter: *Visual character of the corridor would become substantially more urban. Visual quality would be lowered substantially. One ocean view would be lost.* This statement does not address the conclusions in the Visual and Aesthetics Chapter or the Figure referenced. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to acknowledge this severe impact and the DEIR/EIS should be recirculated for public review to allow disclosure of this new significant adverse environmental impact.
Page 3.7-37 7th paragraph	*The overall visual impact of each mitigated build alternative would remain high.*	A Statement Of Overriding Considerations will be required for this project impacts to visual resources / aesthetics (State CEQA Guidelines §15093).
Overall comments	3.7.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures	Deferred mitigation is strictly prohibited in CEQA (consisting of adhering to the following design requirements in consultation with the District 11 Landscape Architect (DLA), and corridor design guidelines would be developed under the direction of the DLA) and Summary page S-9 whereas it states; "*Since the project has not yet been designed, specific visual mitigation measures cannot be proposed at this time*".

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Please list out the requirements and state whether or not they are intended to offset or reduce potential impacts. Please provide a list indicting the locations of all proposed retaining walls, sound barrier walls, mechanically stabilized earth walls, safety railing, landscaping, surface treatments, and overcrossing and undercrossing abutments. This information must be included in a revised DEIR/EIS that is recirculated for public review and comment. As comments previously, use of the terms "should" and "if at all possible" are not enforceable mitigation measures. As such, the language should be revised.
Chapter 3.8 Cultural Resources		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Cultural Resources section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Cultural Resources section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page S-4 2nd paragraph	*Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes: The following resources would be converted: wetlands, sensitive species and natural communities, farmlands, homes, floodplain, cultural resources, and visual resources.*	The Summary chapter states Cultural Resources will be "converted", but does not provide corresponding analysis to support this conclusion. The loss or impact to two (2) archeological resources is in fact significant for the purpose of NEPA and CEQA analysis. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to acknowledge this severe impact and the DEIR/EIS should be recirculated for public review to allow disclosure of this new significant adverse environmental impact.
Page S-10 4th paragraph	*Built Environment Resources* *For the two NRHP/CRHR eligible historic properties identified within the Built Environment APE, 510-514 La Costa Avenue and 767 Orpheus Avenue, project design changes were made that avoided adverse effects to the resources by reducing impacts to an absolute minimum. Therefore no mitigation measures are required.*	The DEIR/EIS states there will be adverse impacts to two (2) historic properties (in Carlsbad and Encinitas) [CA-SDI-12670 and CA-SDI-17928 to be impacted]. The conclusion that "no mitigation measures are required" is not supported by analysis in the DEIR/EIS. Further, on the same page, mitigation measures are referred to. This discrepancy within the DEIR/EIS needs to be resolved and the DEIR/EIS must be revised accordingly.
Page 3.8-1	*Cultural resource reports prepared for the project to date:* *Historic Property Survey Reports (HPSR):* • *[Original] HPSR (March 2007)*	These studies have not been made available for general public review as of 11/1/10. The studies are not included with the DEIR/EIS nor are they available on the project website. These reports should be made with any confidential or sensitive information removed. CEQA requires full disclosure of public record (State CEQA Guidelines §15150) and these documents have been incorporated by reference into the

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	• *First Supplemental HPSR (May 2008)* • *Second Supplemental HPSR (May 2008)* • *Archaeological Survey Reports (ASRs [Original] ASR (2002)* • *Supplemental ASR (December 2006)* • *Second Addendum ASR (July 2008)* • *Third Addendum ASR (July 2008)* *Historic Resource Evaluation Reports (HRER) for historic structures:* • *[Original] HRER (July 2005)* • *First Addendum HRER (August 2006)*	DEIR/EIS. NEPA requires that the appendix contain material prepared in connection with the EIS (CEQ §1502.18)
Page 3.8-2 3rd paragraph	*Three architectural resources are eligible for the NRHP/CRHR: 767 Orpheus Avenue, 636 Leucadia Boulevard, and 510-514 La Costa Avenue…*	This statement conflicts with the Summary chapter findings. Please revise the DEIR/EIS accordingly.
Page 3.8-3 6th paragraph	*Adverse effects would result from soundwall construction, should they be built.*	The DEIR/EIS acknowledges adverse impacts to cultural resources but disregards measures to offset or reduce impacts. Proper acknowledgment of potential impacts would have revealed the need for mitigation.
Page 3.8-3	*None of the three built*	As stated in earlier comments regarding cultural resources, the DEIR/EIS

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
9th paragraph	*environment resources determined eligible within the APE would be adversely affected by the undertaking.*	goes back and forth in regards to 2 or 3 impacted areas. This discrepancy needs to be corrected. In addition, this statement conflicts with the above statement (same page, 6th paragraph) whereas adverse impacts are concluded. The analysis should be revised to disclose potential cultural resource impacts and to reflect necessary mitigation. Where required, mitigation measures should be clearly laid out and in proportion to the adverse impact.
Page 3.8-4 1st and 2nd paragraph	*Additional efforts to avoid causing indirect impacts to eligible archaeological sites would include archaeological and Native American monitoring and establishment of ESAs around the sites. ESAs would be marked on the construction contract Plans, and would be called out in the contract Specifications…*	The City recognizes these items are intended to offset or reduce potential impacts; and therefore, these efforts are designed to avoid impacts which are in fact mitigation measures. The DEIR/EIS should be re-written to acknowledge these statements. For example, if these "additional efforts" are not implemented, what would the impact be? In addition, various discussions pertaining to cultural resources stating there is no mitigation will need to be revised for consistency. See State CEQA Guidelines §§15126.4 & 15380 and CEQ §1508.20.
Chapter 3.17 Natural Communities		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Natural Communities section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Natural Communities section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
General Comment	--	Due to the large geographic scope of the project, the analysis should be revised to provide specific information on particular areas separated by communities or another designation.
Page 3.17-1 4th paragraph	*A total of 30 plant communities, with eight occurring in both disturbed and undisturbed condition, were identified within the Study Area.*	No analysis is provided for the 30 plant communities identified. While the DEIR/EIS provides Tables 3.17-1 and 3.17-2 (permanent and temporary impacts) listing the communities and acreage impacted, there is no corresponding assessment to determine the level of impact. As currently written, the potential impacts from project implementation are not clearly identified. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Page 3.17-6 4th paragraph	*Temporary construction impacts to sensitive upland communities would be 0.04 ha (0.1 ac) Baccharis scrub, 0.07 ha (0.18 ac) of disturbed Baccharis scrub, 1.22 ha (3.02 ac) of CSS, 4.68 ha (11.55 ac) of disturbed CSS, 0.29 ha (0.72 ac) of maritime succulent scrub, 0.02 ha (0.05 ac) native grassland, 5.16 ha (12.75 ac) of nonnative grassland, 0.12 ha (0.29 ac) of southern maritime chaparral, and*	This project is expected to be under construction for some 38 years (2012-2050) and cannot be concluded to result in temporary construction impacts to biological resources. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly. Proper acknowledgement of potential impacts would have revealed the need for more appropriate mitigation, and for examination of alternatives to avoid or reduce affected areas.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	0.75 ha (1.86 ac) of disturbed southern maritime chaparral habitat (Table 3.17-2). Temporary impacts proposed for the 10+4 with Barrier include 1.47 ha (3.64 ac) of open water and 1.37 ha (3.37 ac) of southern coastal salt marsh (Table 3.17.2).	
Page 3.17-9	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures	The five (5) listed conservation measures (presumably mitigation measures) are insufficiently linked to the impacts to upland and wetland communities from project implementation. Tables 3.17-1 and 3.17-2 list other communities having impacted acreage. Furthermore, the last bullet point (#5) states that "All temporary impact areas would be revegetated and restored to pre-existing conditions"; however, this language is vague in determining precise locations (no exhibit demonstrating the areas is provided), or when this conservation measure would occur. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Page 3.17-9 2nd paragraph	*Although impacts to the lagoons cannot be avoided, there are ongoing studies of the hydrology in the lagoons and methods to enhance water flow under the bridges that would be used during the bridge design.*	The Lead Agency will need to prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations (CEQA) based on these environmental consequences. This should be clarified in Chapter 3.24 Irreversible and Irretrievable Effects within the DEIR/EIS. As a Responsible Agency, the City of Oceanside would have to make findings for elements of the project under its jurisdiction and supporting the Statement of Overriding Considerations. However the DEIR/EIS is does not provide the City with adequate analysis to support the conclusions reached by the Caltrans at this time.
Page 3.17-10 through Page 3.17-23	Maps of the vegetation communities overlaid on 2003 aerial are provided in	The use of aerial maps dated back to 2003 is inadequate for the purposes of an environmental review seven (7) years later. These figures should be updated to reflect the current habitat and re-circulated with corresponding

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Figures 3-17.1a to 3-17.1m	analyses. In addition, the chapter states various biological reports were prepared "in support of this section" for the years 2004, 2006, and 2007. Please explain how the 2003 date was to determining to be the appropriate date of figures.
General comment	--	It is unclear why the discussion of potential impacts to wetlands is divided into Chapters 3.17 Natural Communities and Chapter 3.18 Wetlands. When the tables and figure in this chapter include wetlands communities. EIRs and EISs are required to be informational documents designed to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts. At the same time, these documents should be organized and written in a manner that will be meaningful and useful to decision makers and to the public. As currently written, the DEIR/EIS fails to do so for the numerous reasons stated herein.
General comment	Residual impacts	With implementation of the mitigation measures, what is the level of significance of the potential impacts? Without determining if a residual impact would occur, the cumulative impact(s) of the project cannot be properly assessed. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Chapter 3.18 Wetlands and Other Waters		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Wetlands and Other Waters section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirculated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Wetlands and Other Waters Communities section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment"*; however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.18-3 4th paragraph	*There is no way to avoid impacts to the wetlands entirely and still meet the purpose and need for the project.*	A Statement Of Overriding Considerations will be required for this project impact (State CEQA Guidelines §15093).
Page 3.18-4	3.18.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures	A project of this magnitude (spanning 27 miles in length and varying widths, over the duration of 38 years) requires definitive mitigation measures for the potential impacts to wetlands areas. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4, the conservation measures need to state whether they are in fact proposed by the lead agency (as project design features) or expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. Statements such as "Appropriate BMPs" are not sufficient for assessing the level of suitability for mitigation. It is unclear how the fuel of construction vehicles is connected to wetlands impacts; as nowhere in the chapter it is declared as a potential impact to wetlands. Also, "studies underway" (listed as conservation measure #5) is considered deferred mitigation whereas it is unclear how this action is provided to offset or reduce impacts, and will likely require performance standards. CEQA requires mitigation measures be enforceable and roughly proportional. Elsewhere in the chapter (page 3.18-1 1st paragraph) states acknowledgement of conceptual mitigation plans based on the MOU with various resource agencies, as well as a Streambed Alteration Agreement. This information needs to be added to the list of mitigation measures to ensure compliance. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Pages 3.18-5 through 3.18-12	Figures 3-18.1a through 3-18.1h	These figures should be revised to be consistent with all biological chapter figures.
Chapter 3.19 Plant Species		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Plant Species section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Plant Species section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.19-1	3.19.1 Regulatory Setting	Please provide data regarding the federal and State regulatory requirements rather than listing where they can be found.
Page 3.19-1 4th paragraph	*Sensitive plant species with the potential to occur in the Study Area, but that were not observed are described in the NES.*	Which NES it being referenced? 2004 or 2007? The 2004 NES study was not included with the DEIR/EIS Appendix. Only after several requests were made was the 2004 NES made available electronically on August 26, 2010; which was half way into the public review period, and may be considered an attempt to reduce or limit public comment, a violation of both NEPA and CEQA. http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/Env_docs/I-5NCCTechStudies.html
Overall comment	Inadequate figures	As stated in previous comments regarding the biological subchapters, please provide revised figures with the same baseline date for consistent analysis. [This subchapter references studies from 2004 and 2007, and the

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		NOP/NOI were released in 2004, yet it is unclear which date was used in determining the baseline environment]
Page 3.19-1	3.19.2 Affected Environment	Under this heading, the DEIR/EIS lists 11 sensitive plant species observed within the Study Area, however Table 3.19.1: Sensitive Plant Species Impacted by Each Alternative does not include each of these sensitive plant species. As such, the section needs to be revised for consistency within the analysis. As written, this section is adequate for disclosing potential impacts.
Page 3.19-2 6th paragraph	*The majority of these species could potentially be salvaged or mitigated by planting in an offsite preserve.*	It is unclear whether or not this action will be included as part of the project mitigation to offset or reduce the impacts to the Del Mar sand aster, coastal scrub oak, Orcutt's pincushion, sea dahlia, wart-stemmed ceanothus, coast barrel cactus, southern tarplant, and torrey pine would be impacted by each of the alternatives. No mention of this statement is listed under the 3.19.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures section, and use of the term "could" leads the reader to believe the project may or may not comply with such as statement. Passive language such as "could" and "wherever possible" should be revised to more directive language so that mitigation is enforceable, as required by CEQA. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Page 3.19-2	3.19.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures	Please define the term "to the extent practical". If it is determined that this mitigation is not "practical" what other measures will be implemented to offset or reduce project impacts to sensitive plant species?
Chapter 3.20 Animal Species		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Animal Species section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Animal Species section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.20-2	Table 3.20.1: Sensitive Animal Species Observed within the Study Area	The DEIR/EIS lists 21 sensitive animal species observed in the Study Area (Table 3.20.1), but fails to discuss how the project may potentially impact the species. Please revise accordingly.
Page 3.20-3	3.20.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures *The lagoons are important stop over, resting, and foraging habitats for birds migrating along the Pacific flyway. To minimize impacts to migratory birds, construction would not occur in more than two lagoons at any one time.*	Is this mitigation consistent with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act? Please clarify in the revised DEIR/EIS if the resource agencies were consulted regarding the appropriateness of the listed mitigation measures.
Chapter 3.21 Threatened and Endangered Species		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Threatened and Endangered Species section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public,

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Threatened and Endangered Species section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
Page 3.21-1 3rd paragraph	3.21.2 Affected Environment *The section below discusses listed threatened and endangered species observed within the Study Area.*	The DEIR/EIS provides a listing of 18 threatened and/or endangered plant and animal species following this statement. However, the brief discussion of the species is not consistent and should be modified to reflect the survey findings as well as state which biological study is being referenced (i.e., Critical habitat for the least Bell's vireo and the California gnatcatcher occurs within the Study Area within Oceanside). Accuracy in the DEIR/EIS is crucial to assesses potential biological impacts and to provide for mitigation, as necessary. The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly.
Page 3.21-4 3rd paragraph	*Critical habitat for the California gnatcatcher occurs within coastal sage scrub around San Elijo Lagoon, Batiquitos Lagoon, Lawrence Canyon, and near the Center City Golf Course in Oceanside.*	No further discussion or analysis is provided. What are the potential impacts? If there are impacts, what design features or mitigation will be implemented? The DEIR/EIS should be revised accordingly. Proper acknowledgement of potential impacts would have revealed the need for appropriate mitigation, and for examination of alternatives to avoid or reduce affected areas.
Page 3.21-4 5th paragraph	*Construction noise and activities may affect birds*	What are the mitigation measures to offset or reduce these identified impacts?

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	nesting at these sites ([referencing] California least terns, western snowy plovers, and brown pelicans were all identified…). In addition, night lighting due to construction related activities may result in potential adverse effects on breeding behaviors of sensitive species.	
Page 3.21-4 6th paragraph	*Conservation measures are proposed below to minimize any temporary impacts to steelhead trout during construction.*	This chapter needs to be revised to include mitigation measures to the steelhead trout. The first bullet point under 3.21.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures describes that "a channel large enough for fish movement will be kept open…"; however it is unclear is this is reasonable mitigation for the steelhead trout. In addition, the statement "large enough" is too vague to assess the appropriateness of this mitigation measure. In preparing an EIR, the standard and accepted practice among EIR preparers is to list each impact and then describe the mitigation measures intended to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for each impact, followed by the level of impact after implementation of the mitigation measures. The DEIR/EIS fails to identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR. State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4)
Page 3.21-5 1st paragraph	*Long term increases in noise levels from the completed project may affect wildlife species and, therefore, could be considered an indirect*	Noise impacts to wildlife species as a result of project implementation is a direct impact, not an indirect effect as stated. Please revise accordingly. In addition, what is the significance of impacts to wildlife species? CEQA require analysis of potential impacts on all phases of the proposed action/project; including planning, acquisition, development and operation

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	affect to sensitive wildlife species.	(State CEQA Guidelines §15126). NEPA requires discussion of direct and indirect effects as well as their significance (CEQ §1502.16 (a-b)).
Page 3.21-7 6th paragraph	Assessment regarding impact to Del Mar Manzanita	The DEIR/EIS states the project would result in impacts to the Del Mar Manzanita. However, it is unclear if this referenced paragraph is in fact mitigation, and if so, how and when it will be implemented. Also please state where the locations of the impacted Del Mar Manzanita.
Page 3-21.9	*Buena Vista Lagoon* *Loma Alta Creek* *San Luis Rey River*	Project related impacts will need to have roughly proportional mitigation measures. The statement that *Two projects proposed for the area, Coast Highway Seismic Retrofit and the recently completed Pacific Street Bridge have already proposed restoration of the wetlands along the banks of* the [San Luis] *river through exotic removal and revegetation with natives…* is irrelevant for this project in so much that that this project cannot assume mitigation for another project and "piggyback" on it. If no feasible mitigation can be provided or exists for resource impacts, then the DEIR/EIS should disclose this information.
Page 3.21-13	Figure 3-21.1d Critical Habitat	This figure demonstrates the critical habitat along the San Luis Rey River in Oceanside which includes the critical habitat for Least Bell's Vireo, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and the California gnatcatcher. What is the level of impact? What draft mitigation plans have been designed? Which resource agencies have been consulted?
Overall comment	Lack of Figures	This chapter omits critical habitat maps for the Buena Vista Lagoon and Loma Alta Creek in Oceanside, which is inconsistent with the analysis in the chapter. The DEIR/EIS will need to be revised to include critical habitat figures for the Buena Vista Lagoon, Loma Alta Creek, and other water bodies within the Study Area.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Chapter 3.22 Invasive Species		
Overall comment	Lack of impact analysis	The Invasive Species section does not provide analysis [or criteria to use for the basis of analysis] of a proposed project or action, or a thorough analysis of alternatives. These deficiencies in the DEIR/EIS render the document inadequate for meaningful evaluation by the public, Responsible Agencies, or decision makers. The DEIR/EIS must be revised and recirulated.
Overall analysis	Lack of CEQA Thresholds of Significance	The Invasive Species section does not present any criteria for determining the thresholds of significance under CEQA. This is a fatal flaw of the DEIR/EIS and for every resource chapter. The DEIR/EIS must be revised to include these criteria and provide an analysis and recirculated for public review. It is noted that Chapter 4 – CEQA Evaluation lists by bullet point which resource areas *"...would have a less than significant effect on the environment";* however, this is not adequate in determining significance as no threshold is provided. In addition, various resource chapters in fact that there would be impacts (i.e., the Land Use section).
General Comment	*Lack of any figures*	This chapter should be revised to include figures demonstrating invasive species. Other than the statement *African veldt grass has become a dominant species on the cut slope of I-5 between Del Mar Heights Road and Birmingham Drive,* the reader is left to wonder where the other species of invasive species are located.
Page 3.22-1 4th paragraph	*If minimization measures listed below and partnerships are formed, the growth of invasive species may be reduced.*	With project implementation, what will happen if minimization measures listed below and partnerships are <u>not</u> formed?
Page 3.22-1 5th paragraph	*Through careful handling of the soil and equipment that works the soil, the invasive plants currently within the*	Please clarify whether these statements are mitigation measures intended to offset impacts to Invasive Species and to control for further growth/spread. If they are in fact mitigation measures, please state so, and reword the passive language to "shall" rather than "can". Provide

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	impact area can be removed. Revegetation of the slopes would require maintenance to keep the weed species from reinvading the new slopes. Partnerships would be required with the lagoon foundations and landowners to simultaneously work to eradicate similar invasive species outside of the impact areas……	performance standards to verify compliance with mitigation, and to assure the mitigation is in fact working as designed.
Chapter 3.23 Short Term Uses and Long Term Productivity		
General comment	--	This 4 paragraph analysis fails to fully describe the short term and long term impacts as stated throughout the DEIR/EIS. So-called "short-term" impacts of the project will occur over a 38 year construction schedule. Arguably, these are long-term impacts and should be re-characterized as such in a revised and recirculated DEIR/EIS.
Page 3.24-1 1st paragraph	*Implementation of build alternatives would result in attainment of short-term and long-term transportation and economic objectives at the expense of some long-term social, aesthetic, biological, noise, and other land use impacts.*	Cultural resource impacts should be added to the list of long-term transportation objectives.
Page 3.24-1	*The local short-term*	This statement is unclear and unsupported by facts.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
2nd paragraph	*impacts and use of resources by the proposed project is consistent with maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity for the local area and the county.*	
Page 3.24-1 4th paragraph	*Short-term losses associated with the proposed project could include economic losses experienced by businesses affected by relocation; construction impacts such as noise, and motorized and non-motorized traffic delays or detours.*	Also to be included in this list of short-term losses are: relocation and land use impacts to local residents and business owners from the easements and land acquisitions; environmental justice, biological impacts to wetlands, animal and plant species, and aesthetics.
Page 3.24-1 5th paragraph	*Long term losses associated with the proposed project include an insignificant loss of plant and wildlife resources, a permanent visual impact to the surrounding communities, energy use, fuel use, and use of construction materials including concrete, steel and asphalt.*	Also to be included in this list of long-term losses are: cultural resources; aesthetics (viewscapes), land use, growth and community impacts, and environmental justice. The statement "*insignificant loss of plant and wildlife resources*" does not accurately portray the biological impacts to threatened and endangered species, special species, and wetlands (see Biological Environment section of the DEIR/EIS). Please strike the word "insignificant" and revise to state that impacts would be significant and adverse in a revised and recirculated DEIR/EIS.
Chapter 3.24 Irreversible and Irretrievable Effects		

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
General comment		CEQA requires discussion of Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would be Caused by the Proposed Project Should it be Implemented (State CEQA Guidelines §15126(c)). However, another mandated topic *Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented* has been omitted from the DEIR/EIS. As such, please address this topic and recirculate the DEIR/EIS accordingly to allow a meaningful opportunity for the public to review and project comments on this regionally-significant and long-term construction project.
Page 3.24-1 3rd paragraph	*Additionally, large amounts of labor and natural resources are used in the making of construction materials. These materials are generally not retrievable. However, they are not in short supply and their use would not have an adverse effect upon continued availability of these resources.*	It is unclear what natural resources are being referenced here. Biological? Geological? Aggregates? Please clarify. What are the secondary impacts? What irreversible damages are anticipated with project implementation? These effects need to be better described in a revised and recirculated DEIR/EIS.
Chapter 5.0 Comments and Coordination		
Page 5-1 1st paragraph	Early and continuing coordination….	The DEIR/EIS states that Project coordination in the form of Project Development Team (PDT) meetings were initiated in 2000 but fails to list the specific meeting dates. It appears that the last meeting occurred in 2007. No additional formal coordination meetings appear to have been held with Responsible Agencies in the three years leading up to the release of the DEIR/EIS in June 2010. This total lack of communication and coordination

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		denied all parties with an opportunity to get current data and updated information that could have improved the overall scope and content of the DEIR/EIS. Caltrans and FHWA have failed to adequately coordinate with affected agencies and the public denying the decision makers and their constituencies with an adequate opportunity to review the project description and alternatives and provide meaningful comments on the proposed action being considered by Caltrans and FHWA. As noted previously a six year lag between scoping and NOP and release of the DEIR/EIS compromises the entire CEQA and NEPA process by failing to keep potentially affected agencies and parties informed and involved in the project development and environmental review process. The lead agencies must issue a new NOP and NOI and recirculate a revised EIR/EIS.
Page 5-1 2nd paragraph	*In 2001, Caltrans held preliminary public scoping meetings…*	The City of Oceanside is not included on this list. Please explain.
Page 5-1	5.1 Project Scoping Process *Formal Scoping meetings were held from January 7, to March 2, 2004.*	The DEIR /EIS states that the NOP was not filed with the County Clerk or the State until October 20, 2004. Therefore, all of the formal scoping meetings occurred outside of the formal CEQA process and prior to the release of the NOP. Because this is a project of region-wide significance, as defined by CEQA §15206, at least one formal scoping meeting is required pursuant to CEQA §15081 (c)(1) after the NOP has been prepared and issued for public review. Caltrans and the FHWA have failed to follow this basic and fundamental procedural requirement of CEQA and therefore must issue a new NOP and conduct at least one formal public scoping meeting prior to recirculating the DEIR/EIS.
Page 5-1	NOP was sent to the County Clerk	It is not clear if the NOP was ever sent to the State Clearinghouse as required by CEQA . No SCH number was assigned to the project. Please provide documentation that the NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse or issue a new NOP and re-initate the CEQA review process for the project.
Pages 5-1 & 5-2	Formal scoping meetings and additional public outreach meetings listed	The six public scoping meetings held January - March 2004 and listed on page 5-1 is repeated again on page 5-2. It is unclear if these are the same six meetings and they were scoping meetings or additional public outreach meetings.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page 5-1	NOP and NOI comment letters have been received	Although the DEIR/EIS states that 10 NOP comment letters, and 2 NOI comment letters were received by Caltrans and FHWA, the DEIR/EIS fails to include copies of the letters. Instead, the DEIR/EIS includes federal agency letters responding to a request for concurrence on project need. Though not strictly required, failure to include the NOP and NOI comment letters in the DEIR/EIS prevents interested parties in reviewing the comments of other agencies and determining if expressed concerns were addressed by the lead agencies in the CEQA/NEPA document. Therefore, we request that all comment letters received by Caltrans and FHWA on the NOP and NOI be made available for public review as soon as practicable.
Page 5-2 4th paragraph	NEPA Cooperating Agency *An agency may request to be designated as a cooperating agency.*	The City of Oceanside requests designation as a Cooperating Agency under NEPA.
Technical Studies Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR / EIS		
DEIR/EIS Web Link	http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/Env_docs/I-5NCCTechStudies.html	As commented previously, the technical studies were not included with the distribution of the DEIR/EIS. Some of the technical studies have since been located on the referenced web link. Since then, additional technical studies have been added to the project website on 8/6/10, 8/6/10, and 8/26/10 which is well into the public review period, which may or may not thwart the public review process. These technical studies are in fact essential to the DEIR/EIS as they are the basis of the background, setting and impact analysis and conclusions of the DEIR/EIS. Incorporating them by reference is inadequate for purpose of full public disclosure. Additionally, it appears that Caltrans has not made available for public review all documents incorporated by reference as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.
Overall Comment	Technical Studies	The majority of technical studies are said to have been incorporated by reference into the DEIR/EIS. As of 9.20.10 none of the cultural resource

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		studies have been published for review: • Historic Property Survey Reports (HPSR) [Original] HPSR (March 2007) • First Supplemental HPSR (May 2008) • Second Supplemental HPSR (May 2008) • Archaeological Survey Reports (ASRs [Original] ASR (2002) • Supplemental ASR (December 2006) • Second Addendum ASR (July 2008) • Third Addendum ASR (July 2008) • Historic Resource Evaluation Reports (HRER) for Historic Structures - [Original] HRER (July 2005) • Historic Resource Evaluation Reports - First Addendum HRER (August 2006) • Paleontological Resources Assessment (July 2007) DEIR/EIS technical study incorporated by reference (Page 3.1-1), but not posted on the project website and not yet requested as of 9.20.10. • Location Hydraulic Studies (February 2008 and 2009) Pursuant to NEPA and CEQA, an EIS/EIR may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public.
Draft Relocation Impact Report (October 2007, revised May 2010)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150).

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Overall Comment	Outdated Data in Tables	Use of housing data (regarding location, pricing, and availability) going back more than three (3) years ago is inadequate for assessing significant impacts on the human environment, physical environment, and land use. Such tables should be updated to provide current data and re-assessed. The tables which incorporate US Census information may be exempt unless more recent data can be provided. Example: Table 6 uses data supplied from Craigslist, Backpage, and MLS dated 2007.
Page 1 3rd paragraph	*...there are several displacements that may pose some difficulties in finding adequate relocation options.*	The City of Oceanside firmly agrees with this statement. This statement is not accurately portrayed in the findings of the study or mentioned within the analysis of the DEIR/ EIS.
Page 5 1st bullet point under Alignment A	*Two HOV lanes would operate in each direction and would be separated from the general purpose lanes by a 1-to-4-foot*	This statement is inconsistent with the DEIR/EIS and should be revised accordingly.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	buffer.	
Page 7	Basis of Findings	No mention of Oceanside, Encinitas, or Solana Beach City planning documents or references were "*...used as the basis of the finding for this report*" As such, the study should be rewritten to incorporate the City's land use planning and housing documents, as well as the Cities of Oceanside and Encinitas. In addition, the study should include review and project assessment with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) planning and housing documents, among others.
Page 7 1st paragraph	*The proposed project traverses six municipalities, beginning with Oceanside at the northern end of the proposed project, and ending with the City of San Diego at the project's southern terminus. However, relocation impacts are only likely to occur in Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Solana Beach...*	See above comment regarding the Basis of Findings. Use of the term "only" should be removed as impacts are stated to occur to four (4) out of six (6) communities, which is considered significant, as more than 66% of the effected communities will be significantly impacted by the project.
Page 9 1st paragraph	*Land uses within Oceanside surrounding the proposed project are primarily a mixture of singlefamily and multi-family residential areas, as well as general and community commercial centers, open space, and light industrial uses. The*	Is the intent of this paragraph to state that these land uses will be impacted? Please also disclose all potential impacts to business owners, business customers, offices, students, staff, and facility resulting from the direct relocation activities. Please provide an exhibit that demonstrates the impacted lands.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	majority of the land surrounding the proposed project is developed and urban in nature	
Page 11 Table 4	Housing Types Table	The two (2) most populated housing types will be directly impacted by the project. Please explain how this is not considered a significant impact. What criterion was used in the study analysis? This determination needs to be carried into the DEIR/EIS for full disclosure of impacts and sufficiently analyzed to access the impacts to residents, business owners and staff, and visitors for the land relocation.
Page 12	Displacement Units by Alignment in Oceanside Table	This table is flawed by lack of data and by design, and should be revised to include both partial and full land acquisitions. This table is not consistent with the Potential Parcel Impacts Table provided to the City [which is also <u>not</u> included in the DEIR/EIS] which listed some 84 parcels to be impacted. This table only states 47 units. This information needs to be clarified and potentially undated in the DEIR/EIS. It is reasonably concluded that the entire report is flawed based on the total count of 47 impacted units rather than 84 impacted parcels which may or may not include more than one unit on each parcel.
Page 17	Type of Residential Displacements by Alignment in Oceanside Table *note: *Relocation of personal property only should be counted separately and noted whether the items would be moved to the*	The "note" on this table is not clearly understood. Please explain.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	remainder or to a separate site.	
Page 19	Relocation Resources	Please disclose identified "replacement neighborhood" properties by address, street name, and/or exhibit. Without full disclosure, impacts cannot be fully understood or assessed.
Page 19 #2	*Since the relocation neighborhoods selected are the jurisdictions in which the displaces are currently located, the relocation area would be comparable in terms of amenities, public utilities, and accessibility to public services, transportation, and shopping.*	The study states Oceanside is an impacted jurisdiction. The City agrees. What evidence is this statement based on?
Page 19 #3	*The relocation resources are affordable to the majority of residential displacees given the use of replacement housing payments as needed to assist displaced persons/households.*	What evidence is this statement based on? Please define "affordable". Please define "majority". What happens if replacement housing payments are not available, what will be the anticipated outcome?
Page 19 #3	Missing data	Please revise this paragraph/section to include impacts to Oceanside.
Page 20 #4	*There are public projects in the area that would displace other families or make additional housing unavailable concurrently with the subject project. The widening of State*	What are the cumulative impacts? It can reasonably assumed Oceanside would incur greater impacts. Please assess cumulative impacts from displacement.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Route (SR 76) beginning in Oceanside and proceeding eastward through Bonsall may result in the displacement of existing residences, commercial businesses, and a golf course. The ultimate number of impacts and type of impacts would depend on which alternative is selected.	
Page 21 #9	*A field office would not be required for this project as the estimated impacts are in various communities.*	How was this conclusion made? Field office for what types of activities?
Page 23 3rd paragraph	*All four alignments would displace an 8-bedroom SFR in Oceanside. A review of available replacement housing did not find any 8-bedroom SFRs in Oceanside or any of the other relocation neighborhoods. Three 8-bedroom SFRs were found in Rancho Santa Fe, but the value of these homes far exceeded the value of the 8-bedroom SFR in Oceanside. Consequently, it is possible that Caltrans may need to utilize the*	How will the project proponent resolve this adverse impact? Has this statement been added to the DEIR/EIS for assessment under CEQA & NEPA?

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	State's relocation program or LRH options, including LRH payments, to relocate displacees from this 8-bedroon SFR.	
Page 25 #1	Number Of Businesses Directly Impacted By The Project	Please provide a table broken down by City, similar to previous tables. Oceanside would incur impacts to existing and future probable commercial land uses, light industrial land uses, office land uses, and educational land uses. This table should be revised to reflect this information, and as stated in other parts of the study (see Page 9, 4th paragraph, etc…).
Page 26 #4	*There are three to five businesses impacted by the project that are assumed to be minority owned.*	Where are these businesses? This number may not be accurate based on the information contained under Section 3.2 Business and Nonprofit, please check for consistency. Environmental Justice impacts should be considered in the report.
Page 26 #5	Number of Different Type of Facilities	This data is not consistent with page 9, 4th paragraph listing out commercial, industrial, office, educational, and open space land uses.
Page 27 #1	Housing Stock	What is the date and source of these statistics? Should it be updated to reflect current housing trends? Why or why not?
Page 27 #3	Decent, Safe, and Sanitary (DS&S)	Please define.
Page 31 #2.a.	Replacement site requirements	How will the project proponent resolve this adverse impact? The information contained under this heading does not address what the requirements for replacement site are. Please revise this analysis.
Page 33 #2	*The replacement neighborhood is homogeneous to the displacement area.*	This statement should be revised to state: *The replacement neighborhood will be required to be homogeneous to the displacement area.*

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page 33 #4	Condition of units being displaced	What criteria was used to support this conclusion?
Page 34 1st Table (Oceanside)	Missing data	Please complete this table rather that stating "See Table 6" Median Housing Value can be located utilizing various resources, please complete this section, as was done for the Replacement Area.
Page 37	Adequate Resources	This information for availability, funds, staffing, and time is not supported by any evidence. Please state the source of material and disclose the criteria used to support this conclusion. In addition, this information is not consistent with Table 6.
Page 37 1st & 2nd paragraphs	*Relocation resources for each displacee are not limited to the community in which they are currently located.* *These jurisdictions were selected because relocating displacees within the communities in which they currently reside would reduce the hardship associated with relocation, including community cohesion, commute times, etc.*	These statements are conflicting. This section will need to be revised to support the criteria used in developing these statements, and re-assessed to include the discussion of displacing persons, families, and businesses should adequate resources not be available.
Page 38	Market Availability	Please update this section for relevancy in the current housing market.
Page 39	*This project would not significantly impact the local housing stock for the community except as outlined below...* (Oceanside and Carlsbad to be impacted)	The City agrees with this statement. Please carry this conclusion into the DEIR/EIS. Where necessary add mitigation. Revise and recirculate the DEIR/EIS as required under CEQA and NEPA.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Community Impact Assessment (October 2007, Addendum May 2010)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions stemming from responding to comments on the technical studies or new project features, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Page 1-10	Area of Direct Impacts v Area of Secondary Impacts	The report provides one study area (Area of Direct Impacts) based on Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference (SER) Environmental Handbook, Volume 4: Community Impact Assessment (CIA Handbook) which is outlined as 0.5 miles extending parallel to the centerline of the existing I-5 right-of-way. Further, study then provides an Area of Secondary Impacts, equivalent to 54 square miles which essentially encompasses the entire "study area" and outlines on Figure 1-2 Study Area and Regional Land Use. However, the study fails to provide a consistent analysis for the Area of Secondary Impacts, and generally discusses impacts based on close proximity of the project, rather than the entire study area. Based on these fatal flaws, the study should be re-written to address this comment (and others below), and incorporated into a revised and

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		recirculated DEIR/EIS to allow for meaningful public review and to aid the decision makers.
Page 1-13 3rd paragraph	Methodology used to assess the project impacts based on "*...the study area consists of an area of direct impacts (within 1.0 mile of the I-5 corridor) and a wider area of secondary and cumulative impacts.*	See above comment regarding various "study areas". As mentioned under the Methodology section, the study should be rewritten to include a full analysis broken down by each study area and project phase to allow for full disclosure of potential environmental impacts. Where required, mitigation measures (recommendations) should be provided to offset or reduce these impacts.
Page 2-121 2nd paragraph	The total land area of Oceanside within the study area is 10.88 square miles, or 25.8 percent of the total land of Oceanside.	Please revise the inconsistencies within the report. Table 1-1 Study Area Jurisdiction and Census Tracts states 6 square miles, 13 percent. With discrepancies relating to such basic data, it is reasonably concluded that the entire study is flawed and need to be reassessed, where these conclusion are carried over in the DEIR/EIS, revisions are necessary. As currently written, it is unclear if the report based its analysis on 25.8 percent of Oceanside's total land or 13 percent.
Page 2-121 9th paragraph	*There are five freeway interchanges in Oceanside...*	There are additional interchanges within the City boundary that are not addressed here (i.e., Cassidy and California Street) but yet are included in Figure 2.6-15. Please revise the study.
Page 3-6 6th paragraph	Construction related impacts ... construction of a DAR at Oceanside Boulevard could interrupt circulation on Oceanside Boulevard, as well as other roads in the vicinity of the construction,	This potential impact need to be carried into the DEIR/EIS and assessed for impacts to local roadways.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	particularly those that serve the City Center Golf Course. These disruptions *could affect local and regional travel patterns depending on the LOS experienced during peak periods.*	
Page 3-1 3rd paragraph	*Construction of the proposed alternatives would take place in four phases.*	This is inconsistent with the DEIR/EIS. What is the estimated time span for each of the four phases? Without providing a timeframe for construction impact how were impacts assessed? (Please note: while construction impacts are usually considered short term, a 38 year project does not constitute short-term construction impacts) How will project impacts be addressed if the duration of the project lingers. Will another Community Impact Assessment report be prepared? What mitigation measures and performance standards have been proposed to manage the timing of the project? Responses to these questions should be incorporated into the DEIR/EIS as appropriate to assess environmental impacts under NEPA and CEQA.
Page 3-6 6th paragraph	*Various locations within Oceanside could experience temporary disruptions to existing travel patterns, primarily along I-5, during construction activities due to lane restrictions, lane closures, or temporary detours.*	Please define temporary in days/months/years. Is the use of the term "temporary" accurate in describing and assessing project impacts to the City? Please revise this statement to read: *Various locations within Oceanside <u>will</u> ~~could~~ experience ~~temporary~~ disruptions to existing travel patterns, primarily on I-5, during construction activities due to lane restrictions, lane closures, or temporary detours.*
Page 3-38 2nd paragraph	*Implementation of the proposed project would*	What are the operational impacts of the increased ADT on the northbound and southbound I-5 corridor and at the interchanges?

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	result in increased vehicular capacity, and therefore higher ADT volumes on the northbound and southbound I-5 corridor and at interchanges.	Where is this analysis carried over into the DEIR/EIS?
Page 3-38 8th paragraph	*Additionally, the proposed project would consist of the expansion of an existing established freeway corridor and would be consistent with existing land uses.*	Project implementation would modify existing and planned residential land uses and commercial land uses to transportation land uses. This proposed change is not consistent, nor is it supported by any City planning or zoning document. Significant adverse impacts will occur to land use, community impacts, and growth regarding community impacts; in addition to impacts on air quality, noise, aesthetics, biological, cultural, hazards, environmental justice, soils, public services, safety, traffic/transportation, recreational use, educational centers, utility resources, and quality of life. This statement should be deleted from the study as the conclusion is not supported by evidence.
Page 3-37	Section 3.2.6	This section omits the analysis of several community related subjects such as schools and daycare centers, recreational centers and parks, trails, pedestrian and bicycle paths, growth impacts, increasing urbanization or isolation, and community cohesion.
Page 3-39	Table 3.2-10 Consistency with the Oceanside General Plan	This table is fundamentally flawed. The analysis of project consistency with the City's General Plan is absurd, as best. To make the claim that the project "would not alter the existing community character" is unreasonable and unjustified. This table does not include all goals relating to the community. Where this analysis was carried into the DEIR/EIS, considerable revision to- or deletion of the table should occur.
Page 3-40	*Property values in*	Please describe these impacts. What mitigation measures or

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
7th paragraph	*Oceanside could be affected by displaced businesses and residences, changes in the visual environment, improved access to community facilities and other residential areas, and nearby community enhancement projects.*	recommendations does the study provide?
Page 3-40 10th paragraph	*When viewing the proposed project along the entire I-5 North Coast Corridor and the improvements to the region as a whole, property values would most likely improve.*	Based on what evidence? Consider deleting this statement or provide evidence to support this conclusionary statement.
Page 4-1	Chapter 4.0 Community Cohesion	Although this chapter acknowledges several adverse impacts to neighbor cohesion, what are the impacts to the City as a whole community?
Page 4-16 6th paragraph	*Community cohesion for those residents of Oceanside in areas that exhibit traits of elevated community cohesion, specifically those high minority areas in the northern part of the study area, could be affected by changes to existing access and circulation, growth, changes in quality of life, and increasing urbanization and isolation.*	This is a significant adverse impact to the City of Oceanside, and should be acknowledged.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Page 5-1	Table 5.1 Cumulative Impacts	This table does not accurately portray the City's project list, nor does this table provide a date of when said projects were planned, or underway. This table differs from the cumulative project table used in the DEIR/EIS. Further, the References section does not cite any such list or correspondence with City Staff. Please contact the City's Planning Department for an up-to-date list of cumulative projects. Re-assess the proposed project with the cumulative projects and revise both the study and DEIR/EIS. Where required to do so, incorporate mitigation measures intended to offset or reduce impacts.
Page 5-5 4th paragraph	*The Oceanside projects listed in Table 5-1 could result in a cumulative change in travel patterns and increase in population…*	The City acknowledges the project would have significant adverse cumulative impact.
Page 6-5 4th paragraph	*With 17 block groups exhibiting total minority percentages meaningfully greater than that of the general population or over 50 percent, the study area within Oceanside is considered to contain minority populations that would be of potential Environmental Justice concern.*	The City acknowledges the project would have significant adverse impacts to Environmental Justice and would disproportionately affect certain minority and income level groups. These impacts will need to be disclosed and analyzed further in the DEIR/EIS.
Page 6-18	Section 6.6 Mitigation	The Environmental Justice mitigation measures will need to be included for all communities impacted, including the City of Oceanside. The use of passive language "should" will need to be replaced with "shall" to

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		insure compliance with mitigation strategies. If it is not changed, and the mitigation not complied with, what are the residual impacts? These mitigation measures are not included in the DEIR/EIS; although the DEIR/EIS states that the report is incorporated by reference.
Page 8-2	Section 8.2 Mitigation Measures	Mitigation measures previously referenced in the study are not included here. Please explain. The mitigation measures needs to be carried into the DEIR/EIS for full disclosure of land use impacts, community impacts, and growth impacts.
Community Enhancement Plan and Project Notebook (January 2008)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Page 157	Figure 146	This exhibit does not accurately portray the city boundary. Please provide an accurate aerial exhibit and revise the analysis as necessary.
Page 159	Figure 148	The figure is broken down in Groups A-H, none of which include the SR76 interchange or Oceanside Harbor Drive interchange.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		Please revise accordingly.
Visual Impact Assessment (April 2009)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Page 82-83	Project Alternative Exhibits	These pages provide a conceptual rendering for each of the project configurations: 8+4 with buffer, 8+4 with barrier, 10+ with buffer, and 10+4 with barrier. However, these exhibits are seriously flawed; whereas, the number of lanes portrayed does not match the title, and in some cases varies for northbound versus southbound traffic.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		To accurately assess the potential visual impacts and to provide an "after" photo, these rendering should be revised to reflect the actual scope of the project.
Page 155	Conceptual renderings.	Are these renderings to scale? Please revise these renderings to scale if not already done so. The "before" and "after" image of Key View #16 I-5 at Oceanside Boulevard DAR do not appear to accurately portray the effect the project impacts as the added lanes are not provided in a realistic view.
Pages 157	Key View # 16 I-5 at Oceanside Boulevard DAR	The City agrees with the assessment that the proposed 52 foot retaining wall / noise wall would adversely impact viewer sensitivity, visual quality, and community character, and that the residual impact would be a high visual impact. Please carry this analysis over into the DEIR/EIS and evaluate under NEPA and CEQA for project level impacts.
Page 161	Key View #17 Mission Avenue at I-5 in Oceanside	How will the view from the freeway be changed? It is unclear how the assessment which concluded "moderately high" to "high" for quality and sensitivity resulted in "no impact". Please explain.
Page 167	*Mission Avenue in Oceanside (Key View #17) may be reconfigured to provide high volume pedestrian routes…*	Please clarify this statement. The assessment for this Key View assumes this overpass will be modified. What is the impact is this is not completed? What will be the deciding factor whether or not this interchange will be modified?
Page 168 1st paragraph	*Since views such as these are pleasant surprises to first-time travelers, it is questionable whether those viewers would know to expend the effort to peer through the barrier surface and experience that moment of discovery. For*	This statement does not support the decision to not use transparent barrier walls.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	these reasons, noise barriers with transparent material would not avoid or mitigate the loss of scenic views from the freeway.	
Page 171 1st paragraph	*Caltrans and the FHWA mandate that a qualitative/aesthetic approach should be taken to mitigate for visual quality loss in the project area.*	How will this be accomplished? Please be specific.
Page 171 2nd paragraph	*Visual mitigation for adverse project impacts addressed in the previous section would consist of adhering to the following design requirements in consultation with the District 11 Landscape Architect (DLA).*	Following of design requirements is not mitigation, nor does it necessary lessen the adverse impacts. See CEQA Guidelines §§15370 and 15126.4.
Overall comment	Mitigation Measures	Have these measures been effective in other projects? Why or why not? [Noise wall planting pockets, noise wall landscape buffers, landscape noise berms, vertical concrete safety barriers, transparent noise walls, architectural detailing, etc].
Overall comment	Visual Assessment graphs	Please include these graphs in the DEIR/EIS to provide a visual assessment of the adverse aesthetics impacts of project implementation. Please provide corresponding text to assess these graphics in the technical study and DEIR/EIS.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Natural Environment Study (NES) (June 2008)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Page iii	CEQA review for CESA compliance	The summary of the report omits any discussion pertaining to CEQA or the California Environmental Species Act (CESA). Please revise the study to include this discussion as it applied to the project. What resource agencies will be required to participate in the CEQA review process and to ensure mitigation requirements for impacts to sensitive species and habitat will be carried out? What preliminary management plans and mitigation programs are underway? The City requests to be included in the review of resource management plan and mitigation programs which may affect the lands within the City boundary including the planned Buena Vista lagoon restoration project.
Overall comment	Worker Environmental Awareness Program(s)	What types of Worker Environmental Awareness Program(s) have been or will be incorporated in the project design to ensure that project construction

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		and operation occur within a framework of safeguarding environmentally sensitive resources?
Page 3	*Based on the review of species with the potential to occur within the Study Area and the initial habitat assessment, protocol surveys for the following species were completed.* • *Coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica)* • *Light-footed clapper rail (Rallus longirostris levipes)* • *Least Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus)* • *Pacific pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris pacificus)*	These surveys have not been included in the appendices. The City requests these surveys be made available for public review.
Page 3	Section 2.1 Studies Required	This section omits discussion of: • California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) • Western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) • Del Mar manzanita (*Arctostaphylos glandulosa* ssp. *crassifolia*) Please revise to include these discussions, as mentioned on page 3.
Page 13	2.7. Limitations That May Influence Results	Because the project is be constructed over several phases and out to the year 2050, the City does not accept this statement.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Due to the large, complex nature of this project, all surveys cannot be completed for all species every year until the project is constructed.	Studies are required to determine the baseline physical environment; and therefore studies post-construction would not provide an accurate biological setting.
Page 79	4.12 Mitigation	The list of avoidance and minimization measures should be carried over into the DEIR/EIS. For example, the full discussion pertaining to avoiding potential impacts to the endangered Del Mar Manzanita is not found in the DEIR/EIS. In preparing an EIR/EIS, the standard of practice is to incorporate all technical study recommendations and mitigation measures into the document to reduce or offset potential impacts.
Page 80	*A qualified biologist will be made available for both the pre-construction and construction phases to review grading plans, address protection of sensitive biological resources, and monitor ongoing work. The biologist shall be familiar with the habitats, plants, and wildlife of the Project area, and maintain communications with the resident engineer, to ensure that issues relating to biological resources are appropriately and lawfully managed.*	The technical study refers to this statement as a conservation measure intended to minimize impacts to sensitive habitats and species during construction. In addition to reviewing grading plans, the qualified biologist should work with the project design team to educate on-site workers for potential biological issues. What types of compliance strategies will be employed to ensure adherence to the mitigation measure and to verify the measures are in fact appropriate? Will the biological monitor be on-site every day of construction? How many biological monitors will be employed to manage the 27 mile project boundary? What is the expected residual impact after implementation of the states conservation measure?

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		The City suggests the biological mitigation program be rewritten to include performance standards.
Page 80	*A channel large enough for fish passage will be kept open throughout construction within the San Luis Rey River and all of the lagoons.*	Please define "large enough".
Page 81	Compensatory Mitigation Measures	The City requests to be involved in the consultation of and adoption of the compensatory mitigation program for biological impacts. We recommend the resource agencies implement mitigation ratios appropriate to the level of impact.
Page 85	*Buena Vista Lagoon* *Caltrans is currently working with the CDFG and the BVTAC to identify these parcels and is looking into purchasing them. This mitigation would help the overall health of the lagoons and coastal systems without large acres of creation.* *Caltrans has been meeting with the owners of a 3.9 acre parcel in the western basin, west of highway 1 where a resort has been proposed. Purchase of this parcel would be key to*	What will be the determining factor whether or not this happens? If Caltrans to not able to purchase these properties what other methods of mitigation will be employed? If this is proposed mitigation is not implemented, what will occur in its place? Deferred mitigation is prohibited under CEQA.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	limiting additional development adjacent to the lagoon.	
General comment	Revegetation Plan	What types of Revegeation Plans are under consideration/consultation with the various resource agencies?
Noise Report for Sensitive Wildlife Receptors within the I-5 North Coast Project (Appendix F to the NES)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Page 1 2nd paragraph	*This noise report has been prepared to provide preliminary noise contour data to analyze potential project-related noise effects to biological resources located within the study area.*	This noise report fails to address the potential noise impacts from construction including the many types of equipment expected to be used within the study area and construction vehicles, and solely focuses on traffic considerations (existing versus estimated future conditions).
Page 8	*Noise Report for Sensitive*	Although referenced, this report is not included as an appendix and should

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
2nd paragraph	*Wildlife Receptors within the Manchester Avenue Interstate 5 Interchange Project* (Manchester Report) (Department 2003)	be made available for public review to allow for full public disclosure.
Page 10 2nd paragraph	Section 6 ANALYTICAL CRITERIA AND IMPACT METHODOLOGY *No noise thresholds were used to determine the potential for effects of noise on special status bird species.*	How were potential impacts for effects of noise on special status bird species determined? This information needs to be included in a revised report.
Overall comment	Scope of project: The project will cross six (6) lagoons.	Page 1-11 of the DEIR/EIS states: "I-5 also crosses six lagoons – San Dieguito, San Elijo, Batiquitos, Agua Hedionda, Buena Vista and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon." Yet not all lagoons crossed by the Project are discussed in the *Noise Report for Sensitive Wildlife Receptors within the I-5 North Coast Project*. Please explain or revise.
I-5 Lagoons Marine Resource Investigation (June 2006) (Appendix C to the NES)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Overall comment	Scope of Project	Page 1-11 of the DEIR/EIS states: "I-5 also crosses six lagoons – San Dieguito, San Elijo, Batiquitos, Agua Hedionda, Buena Vista and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon." It is unclear why this report only covers the San Elijo, Batiquitos, and Agua Hedionda lagoons.
I-5 Widening Project Pacific Pocket Mouse Habitat Analysis &Trapping Program San Diego County, CA. (June 2003) *(Appendix B to the NES)*		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Limited Phase II Environment Site Assessment, I-5 Expansion Birmingham to Vandegrift Boulevard (October 2006)		

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Pages 1-3 and 29	Executive Summary and Recommendations	The City assumes all recommendations of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report will be adopted within the DEIR/EIS, including but not limited to a site specific health and safety plan, a soils management plan, exported soils will be required to adhere to state requirements, and construction dewatering effluent treated prior to discharge as per the NPDES and/or sewer discharge permit.
Manchester Avenue/Interstate 5 Interchange Project NES Report (January 2004)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	Updated Technical Study and Revised & Recirculated DEIR/EIS	Where appropriate and mandated to do so under NEPA and CEQA, new findings and new conclusions resulting from responding to comments on the technical studies, and where new information requires the revision of the study, the DEIR/EIR is required to be revised and recirculated.
Overall Comment	Availability of this Technical Study.	Public review for the DEIR/EIS commenced 7/12/10. This study was made available for public review 8/26/10 via http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist11/Env_docs/I-5NCCTechStudies.html more than 44 days after the DEIR/EIS release date. This is direct NEPA and CEQA violation, as it thwarts full disclosure for public review and meaningful assessment for the public and decision makers.
Overall Comment	Cover page	EA 24140K is referenced on the cover page. Please make available this Environmental Assessment for public review and comment, as it may be relevant to the project.
Page iv	Table S-2 Special Status Species Impact Matrix	Has this impact matrix been carried into the DEIR/EIS for disclosure and analysis of potential impacts?
Page iv	Table S-2 Special Status Species Impact Matrix	This table lists 16 special status species with suitable habitat area and summary of impacts. Unfortunately, in many instances the "Maximum Compensatory Mitigation Amount or Area" column states N/A, in other places the response is "To be determined through discussions with the resource agencies". The response N/A is not adequate to meet the requirements of CEQA; whereas, CEQA requires mitigation measures intended to offset or reduce impacts. The response "To be determined through discussions with the resource agencies" should be revised to include *draft* mitigation program details for the terrestrial resources based on standard resource agency protocols for the special status species. Please recalculate this column and revise the study. As it applied to the analysis carried into the DEIR/EIS, please revise and recirculate the DEIR/EIS.

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
Overall Comment	Biological Mitigation	The following Chapters of the DEIR/EIS list this technical study as incorporated by reference: 3.19 Plant Species, 3.20 Animal Species, 3.21 Threatened and Endangered Species. However, because this study was prepared for another project and for the City of Encinitas as the CEQA Lead Agency, will the mitigation measures included in this study be included in the DEIR/EIS? Why or why not?
Paleontological Resource Assessment, I-5 NCC Project, Caltrans District 11, San Diego County, California		
Overall Comment	The City of Oceanside (Cooperating Agency / Responsible Agency)	Report not yet made available as of 11/1/10. As a Cooperating Agency under NEPA and Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Paleontological Resource Assessment report should be made available for professional peer review and to access the project for impacts to paleontological resources. If required to do so by law, the sensitive location information can be blacked-out to protect the paleontological resource.
Historic Property Survey Reports (HPSR)[Original] (March 2007) First Supplemental HPSR (May 2008) and Supplemental HPSR (May 2008)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	Reports not yet made available to the public as of 11/1/10. This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	The City of Oceanside (Cooperating Agency /	As a Cooperating Agency under NEPA and Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Historic Property Survey Reports should be made available for

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
	Responsible Agency)	professional peer review and to access the project for impacts to cultural resources.
Historic Resource Evaluation Reports (HRER) for Historic Structures [Original] HRER (July 2005), First Addendum HRER (August 2006)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	Reports not yet made available to the public as of 11/1/10. This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	The City of Oceanside (Cooperating Agency / Responsible Agency)	As a Cooperating Agency under NEPA and Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Historic Resource Evaluation Reports should be made available for professional peer review and to access the project for impacts to cultural resources.
Archaeological Survey Reports (ASRs [Original] ASR (2002), Supplemental ASR (December 2006), Second Addendum ASR (July 2008), and Third Addendum ASR (July 2008)		
Overall comment	Incorporated by Reference	Report not yet made available to the public as of 11/1/10. This technical report is incorrectly stated to be Incorporated by Reference into the DEIR/EIS (CEQ § 1502.21 and State CEQA Guidelines §15150). As currently prepared, the DEIR/EIS is inadequate to satisfy NEPA and CEQA requirements regarding the use of incorporated materials because the DEIR/EIS does not provide citation in the body of the analysis, no

DEIR / EIS Reference Section	Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project DEIR/EIS Text	City of Oceanside Comment on DEIR/EIS
		relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document (this technical study) and the EIR is described, and in many cases said referenced materials have not been made available to the public. The DEIR/EIS should be revised to include citation referencing as per the requirements of NEPA and CEQA.
Overall Comment	The City of Oceanside (Cooperating Agency / Responsible Agency)	As a Cooperating Agency under NEPA and Responsible Agency under CEQA, the Archaeological Survey Reports should be made available for professional peer review and to access the project for impacts to archeological resources.

EXHIBIT 2

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: ORA LEE KLEMME **Address:** 602 S. NEVADA ST O'SIDE

Comments: Why was there no input from Caltrans at this meeting?

I would like to see taxpayers' funds spent on mass transit / public transportation rather than paving over much more of beautiful southern California's coastal region. We need foresight, creativity + imagination rather than "business as usual". I say No to freeway expansion. "you don't build your way out of congestion"

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Joan Bullock **Address:** 1800 Bayberry Dr., Oceanside

Comments: We need to change the mode of transportation from auto to that of mass transit. Increasing the size of I5 is not in our best interest. The I5 widening is a waste of money. Lets put the money toward positive transportation choices. How can we change transportation funds for freeways to building mass transit?

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: ORA LEE KLEMME **Address:** 602 S. NEVADA ST O'SIDE

Comments: Why was there no input from Caltrans at this meeting?

I would like to see taxpayers' funds spent on mass transit / public transportation rather than saving over much more of beautiful southern California's Coastal region. We need foresight, creativity + imagination rather than "business as usual". I say No to freeway expansion. "you don't build your way out of congestion"

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: NEIL DUCKER **Address:** 1446 MORENO ST

Comments: I HAVE BEEN LOOKING FORWARD TO A "SOUND ABATEMENT WALL" FOR 12 YEARS. I HAD NO IDEA OF THE IMPACT ON MYSELF AND MY NEIGHBORS.

ADDING ALL THESE LANES IS NOT THE ANSWER. I WOULD SUGGEST ADDING 2/4 (2 EA WAY) LANES WITH RAPID TRANSIT SIMILAR TO BART (BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT) LIGHT RAIL! IN THE BAY AREA. WHAT CAL TRANS IS PROPOSING WILL DESTROY THE QUALITY OF LIFE ON THE NORTH COUNTY COASTLINE.

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: PAUL NEVINS Address: 2014 MOUNTAIN VISTA WAY OCEANSIDE 92054

Comments: WE KNOW FROM THE EXPERIENCE THE I-15 AND 805 CORRIDOR NEIGHBORHOODS HAD THAT ONCE A FREEWAY EXPANSION OR EXTENSION IS OFFICIALLY IN THE PIPELINE THAT THE INVESTMENT IN THE AREA STOPS - NEIGHBORHOODS ~~AFTER~~ FALL INTO RUIN, AREAS ARE IN LIMBO UNTIL AFTER THE CONSTRUCTION IS OVER BUT CALTRANS NEVER GETS THE JOB DONE ON TIME. WE ARE LOOKING AT 20 TO 30 TO 50 YEARS OF STAGNATION AND BLIGHT! FOR WHAT? A MONSTER FLOOD OF TRAFFIC!

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Carol Kissin **Address:** 5162 Prado Ct. Oceanside

Comments: How long will it take to implement the proposed widening? By the time it is implemented, will it still solve the traffic problem? If not, will Cal Trans then propose another widening project? How many times do we have to do this before you admit that it doesn't solve anything?

You're talking about taking people's homes and negatively impacting our delicate lagoon ecosystems, as well as our beautiful surroundings. That's an awful lot of damage for a temporary fix.

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

☆ We already voted on yes for high speed rail - invest in rail. ☆

Name: Heidi Franczyk **Address:** 810 Leonard O'side 92054

Comments: We do not support this project for many reasons. Oceanside has a lot of potential to be a transit hub. We need to put these resources towards rail systems, walkability and planning of city centers around these systems (T.O.D.!!!) This plan of widening the 5 will only create more toxic CO^2 gas and toxic smog in our community. It is not good for health, business, quality of life or the well being of our community.

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: ANTHONY INTRIERI **Address:** 1102 S. MYERS ST OCEANSIDE, CA 92054

Comments: Thank you for the clear explanation of the process of this project - what the EIR means and how to ask questions.

A project like this might be needed, but it must have a minimal impact on as few homeowners as possible.

Thank you for this meeting

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Athena Capsis **Address:** 1873 N. Volcan ave
acapsis@cox.ne

Comments:

There is no doubt in my mind I-5 expansion should not happen.

Is this ultimately decided by Sandag? so we need to influence our local reps at in Sandag. So we need a critical ~~So the more~~ mass of people to be sure the officials vote correctly?

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Don Christiansen **Address:** 3715 Longview Drive
Carlsbad

Comments: Thank you for taking the initiative to have this timely and important meeting.

More Effective Mass Transit!!

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Pat Wallace Address: 1901 Bush St. Apt 101 92058

Comments: I very much oppose this widening of I-5 because
1) It's useless - more traffic by the time it's built & terrible during the building.
2) Environment results are very bad: air & noise
3) Ridiculous to give up present beauty of ocean
4) Walls bad for business.
5) Public Transportation is sensible for future.

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Joan Beckman **Address:** 1017 Alberta Ave
Ocsd, CA

Comments:

The root of the problem is the refusal to convert existing lanes to HOV. We must overturn the lawsuit or whatever Caltrans uses to avoid changing existing lanes to HOV.
All freeways must have the #1 lane designated HOV by decree.
For every freeway of 3 lanes or more the #1 lane must be HOV statewide.
For all freeways of 4 or more lanes, the #1 and #2 lanes must be HOV statewide.
This should be done by law regardless of signage.

Caltrans North Coast Corridor DEIR/DEIS
Public Meeting Comment Card
City of Oceanside, Thursday, September 30th 2010

Name: Joan Beckman **Address:** 1017 Alberta Ave
Ocsd, CA

Comments:

The true cost of any freeway expansion must be considered. Beyond noise + views, the land is valuable. Each acre must be valued at the highest (hotel, etc) value NOT the lowest (ie condemned). Airpollution is measured in the lives of children. Views lost impact all tourist and resident uses.

Noise is a medical ~~cos~~ and safety cost as people are more stressed.

Analyses must put a high price/cost on all this.

Dear Mr Jack Feller:

I am a very concerned resident and homeowner of the Oceanside Community. I am aware of the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor Project Draft Environmental Report/Environmental Impact Statement. Last month I attended an informational meeting. Please take a stand against this horrific project!

I have several questions regarding this plan.

How will this effect coastal marine life due to the freeway's very close proximity to coastal lagoons, rivers and surf? How much run off from oil and debris will be added to our ocean? How will we clean this increased pollution from our beaches and ocean waters?

How will this increase of air pollution affect our children's health attending the neighboring schools of Oceanside High School, South Oceanside Elementary, and Laurel Elementary? Two of these schools have athletic field backed up against the freeway as it is. How will you inform parents of this increased health hazard from the neighboring freeway? What will be the cost of increased cases of bronchial issues and asthma caused by the air pollution?

Why is CalTrans not increasing railway service on existing railway running north south along the coastal corridor? Why doesn't the Coaster train run on Sunday? Why on Saturday is rail service greatly restricted? Weekends are the time when traffic is consistently the worst and this is the time when train services are greatly deficient.

Will this actually increase people's use of cars for transpiration from Oceanside to San Diego due to the quicker travel time? Will more people choose to live in North County and work in San Diego due to this freeway construction? Wouldn't this actually increase traffic?

I look forward to all of your responses. I am very concerned and hope the cost of this project is truly evaluated before it is begun.

Sincerely,

Heidi Franczyk

810 Leonard Ave.

Oceanside, CA 92054

heidifranczyk@hotmail.com

EXHIBIT 3

STAFF COMMENTS

John Amberson

From: Curtis M. Jackson
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2010 4:22 PM
To: John Amberson
Cc: Jane McVey
Subject: Comments on I-5 Widening Impact on Center City Golf Course

John,

Here are my comments on the impact of the I-5 widening on Center City Golf Course.

Per page 2-64, **Figure 2-2.14ak Projects Features Map: 10+4 Buffer Alternative**(Oceanside Blvd. to Mission Avenue), of the DEIR for the I-5 widening, there will be significant impact to Center City Golf Course. With the current layout of the golf course, it would be near impossible to move or relocate impacted holes as there is no additional space on the facility. If any holes were eliminated, a complete redesign of the course will be required.

The proposed Direct Access Ramp ("DAR") would take .89 acres of land away from the golf course on the southwest corner of the premises. With the DAR using State Street as the on-ramp, at least three golf holes would be directly impacted. The end of State tree Drive is directly adjacent to the putting-green of hole #2, and the tee boxes of hole #3 and hole #5. Overall hole #5 would be completely eliminated, and the other two holes would need major modifications that the site potentially could not accommodate. Additionally, with the DAR so close to the course, large netting, similar to what is located on a driving range, would at a minimum be needed parallel to the DAR.

Curtis M. Jackson
Property Agent
City of Oceanside
(760) 435-5163
(760) 435-5169
cjackson@ci.oceanside.ca.us

Comments from City Staff

- There is a lack of alternatives that were studied in Oceanside. The study only considers an 8 + 4 Buffer Alternative in Oceanside. Additional alternatives need to be studied such as an 8 + 2, 10 + 2, and with more consideration given to transit.
- City code section 2.81 prohibits the sale or lease of city property used for park and recreational purposes without approval of the voters. Any property takes intended for these types of uses will need to get voter approval.
- The study does not adequately address how traffic will be mitigated for and the impacts it will have on local city streets (i.e. Vista Way between I-5 and Coast Highway). Additional traffic studies need to be performed to study the impacts and mitigation required on impacted city streets.
- The study does not adequately address how traffic will be mitigated for during construction. Construction on the I-5 in Oceanside will take years to complete and traffic will need to be addressed on how it will be impacted and handled (most importantly on local city streets) during the construction phase.
- The location of the DAR at Oceanside Boulevard may not be in the best interest of the City. Additional studies need to be performed to justify this location and/or perhaps considering another location in its place such as a DAR connecting directly to Camp Pendleton.
- The study recommends the removal of the eastbound Vista Way to northbound I-5 loop ramp. Is the removal required because of the r-o-w required for the I-5 expansion, or because of the limited weave length for eastbound traffic on Vista Way with eastbound SR-78 coming from southbound I-5? If the reasoning is because of the weave length, it may be in the City's best interest to determine if the southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-78 flyover is going to be built. This will virtually remove the weave conflict issue and hence allow for the loop ramp to remain intact. Further discussion needs to take place concerning this issue before a recommendation can be made. Additionally, the study makes no mention of how the number of trips displaced is going to be mitigated for with the closure of the loop ramp.
- Maintaining the visual corridor towards the ocean remains a priority for the City. Specific mitigation measures such as soundwalls will need to be carefully considered, and when required, applied in such a manner that minimal impact is realized to the visual corridor.
- The study recommends a pedestrian underpass improvement at the San Luis Rey River. It does not seem that a pedestrian overpass was considered as a possible alternative. A pedestrian overpass needs to be studied and compared with the underpass to determine which crossing fits best with the community enhancements for this neighborhood.