SAN YSIDRO LAND PORT OF ENTRY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

SAN YSIDRO, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Volume I

Prepared by the
United States General Services Administration

September 2013

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SAN YSIDRO LAND PORT OF ENTRY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
SAN YSIDRO, CALIFORNIA

SEPTEMBER 2013

Lead Agency: U.S. General Services Administration (GSA)
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA, 94102

Lead Agency Contact: Mr. Osmahn Kadri
NEPA Project Manager
Portfolio Management Division (9PTC)
U.S. General Services Administration
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California, 94102
Telephone: (415) 522-3617
Email: Osmahn.Kadri@gsa.gov

Availability of Draft SEIS: This document is available for public review at the San Ysidro Library (101 West San Ysidro Boulevard, San Diego, CA 92173) and on the GSA website (www.gsa.gov/nepalibrary).

Abstract: This document is a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Improvements Project. The information in this document is intended to supplement the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was adopted for the San Ysidro LPOE Improvements Project in August 2009. In September 2009, GSA prepared a Record of Decision (ROD) that approved the Preferred Alternative (herein referred to as the Approved Project) that was identified in the 2009 Final EIS. This SEIS documents and evaluates changed circumstances and proposed modifications to the Approved Project since adoption of the 2009 Final EIS; the Approved Project with proposed modifications is herein referred to as the Revised Project.

The Approved Project and Revised Project entail the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing San Ysidro LPOE in three independent phases to improve overall capacity and operational efficiency at the LPOE. The San Ysidro LPOE is located along Interstate 5 (I-5) at the United States (U.S.) – Mexico border in the San Ysidro community of the City of San Diego, California.

GSA is proposing modifications to the Approved Project, including (1) the incorporation of northbound pedestrian inspections at the proposed southbound-only pedestrian crossing facility on the west side of the LPOE and modification of the phasing/timing of the construction of the pedestrian crossing facility; (2) changes to the development footprint on the west side of the LPOE and design refinements to the proposed Virginia Avenue transit facility; (3) a change in the number of vehicle lanes and the installation of southbound inspection booths and overhead canopies on the proposed southbound roadway; and (4) minor changes in the design and/or timing of implementation of several project elements. In addition to these proposed changes to the Approved Project, the Revised Project also includes the other components of the Approved Project that have not changed.

The changed circumstances associated with the Approved Project include changes to the phasing/timing of funding for proposed improvements and the construction of a temporary southbound roadway that connects I-5 and the El Chaparral LPOE in Mexico.

Due to the changed circumstances and changes to the Approved Project, GSA made the decision to prepare an SEIS for the Revised Project.

This Draft SEIS analyzes two alternatives of the Revised Project, as well as the No Action Alternative (which would implement the Approved Project with no changes). The Revised Project alternatives are referred to as the Six-lane Alternative and the Ten-lane Alternative; both of the Revised Project alternatives include the proposed modifications described above, as well as the other improvements originally proposed as part of the Approved Project analyzed in the Final EIS. The only difference between the two Revised Project alternatives is the number of lanes in the southbound roadway and the corresponding number of southbound inspection booths in the primary vehicular inspection area and vehicular spaces in the secondary inspection area.

Public Comments: Comments on the Draft SEIS may be submitted through the 45-day comment period (by November 12, 2013), which will commence with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's publication of the Notice of Availability for this document in the *Federal Register*. Comments may be submitted in writing or by email to the GSA contact identified above.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Title** **Page**

Section **Title** **Page**

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

LIST OF FIGURES

SUMMARY

SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This document is a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Improvements Project. The information in this document is intended to supplement the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was adopted for the San Ysidro LPOE Improvements Project in August 2009 (2009 Final EIS; *San Ysidro Land Port of Entry Improvements Project Final Environmental Impact Statement*). In September 2009, the United States (U.S.) General Services Administration (GSA) prepared a Record of the Decision (ROD; *Record of Decision San Ysidro Land Port of Entry Improvements Project*) that approved the Preferred Alternative (herein referred to as the Approved Project) that was identified in the 2009 Final EIS. This SEIS documents and evaluates changed circumstances and proposed modifications to the Approved Project since adoption of the 2009 Final EIS; the Approved Project with proposed modifications is herein referred to as the Revised Project.

The Approved Project and Revised Project entail the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing San Ysidro LPOE in three independent phases to improve overall capacity and operational efficiency at the LPOE. The San Ysidro LPOE is located along Interstate 5 (I-5) at the U.S.-Mexico border in the San Ysidro community of the City of San Diego (City), California.

Approved Project

The 2009 Final EIS identified a Preferred Alternative that was approved by GSA through a ROD in 2009. The Approved Project is currently being implemented as funding is procured. As described in the 2009 Final EIS, the Approved Project would demolish most of the existing facilities, and new facilities would be constructed in three independent phases. Phase I focuses on the reconfiguration of the northbound facilities, but also includes a pedestrian bridge and a new southbound pedestrian crossing facility on the east side of the LPOE. Phase II primarily would involve the construction of new buildings, and Phase III mainly would involve reconfiguration of the southbound facilities as well as a new southbound roadway that would connect with Mexico's El Chaparral LPOE, and a new southbound-only pedestrian crossing and transit facility on the west side of the LPOE at Virginia Avenue.

Phase I improvements are fully funded and some Phase I improvements of the Approved Project have been, or are currently being, constructed, including the east-west pedestrian bridge over I-5 and the LPOE (completed in April 2011), the new southbound pedestrian crossing facility on the east side of the LPOE (completed in August 2012), the northbound secondary inspection area (completed in August 2012), the northbound primary inspection area (currently under construction), and the northbound operations center (currently under construction).

Revised Project

GSA is proposing modifications to the Approved Project, including (1) the incorporation of northbound pedestrian inspections at the proposed southbound-only pedestrian crossing facility on the west side of the LPOE and modification of the phasing/timing of the construction of the pedestrian crossing facility; (2) changes to the development footprint on the west side of the LPOE and design refinements to the proposed Virginia Avenue transit facility; (3) a change in the number of vehicle lanes and the installation of southbound inspection booths and overhead

canopies on the proposed southbound roadway; and (4) minor changes in the design and/or timing of implementation of several project elements. In addition to these proposed changes to the Approved Project, the Revised Project also includes the other components of the Approved Project that have not changed.

The changed circumstances associated with the Approved Project include changes to the phasing/timing of funding for proposed improvements and the construction of a temporary southbound roadway that connects I-5 and the El Chaparral LPOE in Mexico.

Due to the changed circumstances and changes to the Approved Project, GSA made the decision to prepare an SEIS for the Revised Project.

S.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

Purpose of the Revised Project

The purpose of the Revised Project is the same as the Approved Project that was identified in the Final EIS. The purpose of the Revised Project is to improve operational efficiency, security, and safety for cross-border travelers and federal agencies at the San Ysidro LPOE. The original goals of the Approved Project that were identified in the Final EIS remain applicable to Revised Project, and are restated below:

- Increase vehicle and pedestrian inspection processing capacities at the San Ysidro LPOE
- Reduce northbound vehicle and pedestrian queues and wait times to cross the border
- Improve the safety of the San Ysidro LPOE for vehicles and pedestrians crossing the border and for employees at the LPOE
- Modernize facilities to accommodate current and future demands and implementation of border security initiatives, such as the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI), the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology program (US-VISIT), and the Secure Border Initiative (SBI)

In addition, the original goals are supplemented by the following goals that reflect the Revised Project:

- Provide facilities to enhance mobility and multi-modal connections in San Ysidro
- Reduce southbound vehicle queues and wait times to cross the border during "pulse and surge"[1] southbound inspections

Need for the Revised Project

Capacity and Transportation Demand

The border area of San Diego county and Tijuana, Mexico currently has a combined population of more than 4.8 million people (SANDAG 2011). The San Diego region is forecasted to increase to 4.4 million people by the year 2050, and the City of Tijuana is estimated to experience a population increase to approximately 5 million by the year 2050 (SANDAG 2011),

[1] CBP periodically conducts southbound vehicle inspections for a maximum duration of 30 minutes per inspection event.

resulting in a combined 2050 border area population of approximately 9.4 million people, nearly double the current population. This makes the San Diego and Tijuana region the largest urban border area along the entire U.S.-Mexico border.

Land border crossing infrastructure includes LPOEs and roadways and facilities that provide access to LPOEs. Two international LPOEs, San Ysidro and Otay Mesa, currently link San Diego and Tijuana, while a third LPOE is located east of the San Diego metropolitan area at Tecate. Collectively, these LPOEs serve as the gateway for all pedestrian traffic and vehicular movement of people and goods between the San Diego region and Baja California, Mexico. To accommodate the dynamic border transportation system and projected population growth and associated movement of people and goods, major new projects to improve land border crossing infrastructure are planned; these include a fourth LPOE, known as Otay Mesa East, and a proposed cross border facility that would connect the Otay Mesa community with Tijuana International Airport. Improvements at the existing LPOEs are also planned, including the San Ysidro LPOE, where the major reconfiguration and improvements that were identified in the Final EIS have begun.

The San Ysidro LPOE is the busiest land port in the Western Hemisphere and is the region's primary gateway for cross-border automobile and pedestrian traffic. It is open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, and processes passenger vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, bus, and limited use rail traffic. Commercial vehicle inspections are conducted at the nearby Otay Mesa LPOE. The San Ysidro LPOE processes an average of approximately 50,000 northbound vehicles and 25,000 northbound pedestrians per day (GSA 2013a). In 2011, the San Ysidro LPOE processed northbound inspections of approximately 12.3 million passenger vehicles, 61,000 buses, and 8.4 million pedestrians, resulting in more than 30 million individual crossings from Tijuana to San Diego (U.S. Department of Transportation [DOT] 2012). It is estimated that a similar number of southbound crossings occur from San Diego to Tijuana, which equates to more than 60 million individual crossings in 2011 at the San Ysidro LPOE (SANDAG 2011).

The existing San Ysidro LPOE has become a bottleneck in the system of interchange between the two countries, increasingly restricting the movement of passenger vehicles and pedestrians during peak times. Existing wait times at the San Ysidro LPOE during the commuter peak period (weekdays between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM) average 1.5 to 2 hours for vehicles and 1 hour for pedestrians (CBP 2013).

Improvements to the San Ysidro LPOE are needed because the capacities of the existing LPOEs in the region and the San Ysidro LPOE specifically are currently being exceeded, causing excessive border wait times. Cross-border travel is forecasted to continue to grow, due to projected local and regional growth and economic activity, and border delays are expected to increase correspondingly, placing a strain on existing border facilities including the infrastructure at the San Ysidro LPOE. As noted in the Final EIS, it is estimated that maximum wait times would exceed 3 hours during the commuter peak period by the year 2014, and 10 hours by the year 2030 if no improvements are constructed (KOA Corporation 2009). Pedestrian and passenger vehicle border crossings between the U.S. and Mexico have substantially risen in the past decade, reaching over 60 million people in 2011 in the San Diego County/Baja California border area alone, as discussed above, and it is estimated that cross-border traffic will increase by more than 40 percent by the year 2050 (SANDAG 2050 RTP). This increase in cross-border travel, in combination with increases in U.S. security requirements has resulted in operational and infrastructure-related challenges. The existing facilities were not designed to accommodate the current and projected traffic volumes processed at the San Ysidro LPOE. Given the current

and projected travel demand at the San Ysidro LPOE, improving the capacity and operations of the current infrastructure is critical to decrease traffic congestion and cross-border wait times.

Safety and Border Security

In addition to the need to expand the San Ysidro LPOE to improve operational efficiencies, the Revised Project would address public and employee safety and border security concerns. Buildings within the LPOE are approximately 40 years old and cannot effectively support U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) enforcement operations. Due to the age and condition of the existing buildings, a retrofit and remodel of the existing LPOE is required to accommodate operational needs.

Furthermore, the mandated implementation of border security programs such WHTI, US-VISIT, and SBI, requires modernization and facility upgrades. These programs require DHS to implement new inspection technologies to track cross-border traffic at the San Ysidro LPOE. The WHTI plan, as directed by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, is designed to enhance U.S. border security while facilitating legitimate travel and trade. Under WHTI, travelers entering the U.S. must present specified documentation that proves both identity and citizenship. US-VISIT is a program that uses biometric data (digital finger scans and photographs) to verify travelers' identity and to check against a database of known criminals and suspected terrorists. The SBI is a multi-year plan to add more border patrol agents; expand illegal immigrant detention and removal capabilities; upgrade border control technology, including manned/unmanned aerial assets, and detection technology; increase investment in border infrastructure improvements; and increase interior enforcement of U.S. immigration laws. To implement these security programs, an increase in staff, space, and systems is needed, which cannot be accommodated within the existing configuration of the LPOE.

Cross-border Mobility

As previously discussed, the San Ysidro LPOE is the busiest land port in the Western Hemisphere and processes an average of approximately 50,000 northbound vehicles and 25,000 northbound pedestrians per day, with an estimated equivalent number of daily southbound crossings. Thus, a total of approximately 100,000 vehicles and 50,000 pedestrians cross through the LPOE every day. Pedestrian counts taken in both the northbound and southbound directions are consistent these estimated total existing pedestrian volumes. Based on the pedestrian counts, the total daily number of pedestrians crossing the border is approximately 54,100 (LLG 2013).

Many of the pedestrians crossing the border connect to other transportation modes to reach their ultimate destination. According to a recent pedestrian origin and destination survey, 41.6 percent of pedestrians use the trolley, 17.2 percent use buses, 4.6 percent use taxis, 21.7 percent use privately owned vehicles, and 14.5 percent continue as pedestrians (LLG 2013).

Existing multi-modal facilities near the LPOE include the SYITC located on the east side of I-5 along East San Ysidro Boulevard and directly adjacent to the LPOE. This transit center accommodates public access to the trolley and local bus routes, as well as taxis, private jitneys (e.g., vans or shuttle buses), and intercity and shuttle buses. The San Ysidro Trolley Station, located along the MTS Blue Line that carries customers between the border and downtown San Diego, is the busiest trolley station in San Diego County. In 2011, there were approximately 11,500 boardings per day and a total of 20,000 trips that ended at this trolley station

(SANDAG 2013). Other multi-modal facilities and connections near the LPOE include a passenger loading area at the Camiones Way cul-de-sac on the west side of I-5, a taxi staging area along Camino de la Plaza, MTS bus stops along local roadways, private bus operator facilities, sidewalks, and bike lanes along some local roadways. Given the location and use of these multi-modal facilities to access the LPOE, pedestrian linkages to multi-modal facilities at and near the LPOE are vital to the movement of people crossing the border.

Long-term forecasts estimate that cross-border pedestrian traffic will increase by more than 85 percent by 2030 and vehicular traffic will increase by more than 40 percent by the year 2050 (LLG 2013 and SANDAG 2050 RTP). Additionally, over 750 federal employees currently work at the LPOE, and it is estimated that this number will increase to over 900 with the forecasted increase in cross-border travel at the LPOE. Because of the large number of people with the common destination of the LPOE, there is a need to increase the efficiency of the border transportation system. To do so, all modes of transportation must be accommodated, and an integrated system of vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities is needed, beyond what provided under the existing configuration of the LPOE.

S.3 REVISED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Draft SEIS analyzes two alternatives of the Revised Project, as well as the No Action Alternative (which would implement the Approved Project with no changes). Both of the Revised Project alternatives include the following proposed modifications, as well as the other improvements originally proposed as part of the Approved Project:

- The inclusion of the proposed Phase III pedestrian crossing facility on the west side of the LPOE at Virginia Avenue into Phase I.
- The addition of a northbound pedestrian crossing lane at this proposed pedestrian crossing facility to make it a bi-directional pedestrian crossing facility.
- Modifications to the development footprint and design of the proposed Virginia Avenue Transit Facility.
- Changes to the number of vehicular lanes in the proposed southbound roadway.
- Installation of southbound inspection booths in the proposed southbound roadway.
- Changes in the timing of implementation of several project elements (i.e. switching among phases).
- Other design changes to the Approved Project (east-west pedestrian bridge, employee parking structure, employee parking lot, staff pedestrian bridge, communications tower, central plant, northbound primary inspection lanes, northbound secondary inspection area, southbound secondary inspection area, and U.S. Border Patrol Facility).

The only difference between the two Revised Project alternatives is the number of lanes in the southbound roadway and the corresponding number of southbound inspection booths in the primary vehicular inspection area and vehicular spaces in the secondary inspection area. Each of the alternatives is briefly described below.

Six-lane Alternative

The Six-lane Alternative would include the bi-directional pedestrian crossing facility, the modified Virginia Avenue transit center, six southbound vehicular lanes with six southbound

inspection booths with an overhead canopy in the southbound roadway, six vehicular inspection spaces with an overhead canopy in the southbound secondary inspection area, and other design modifications to the Approved Project. As the six southbound lanes approach the border, they would divide into 19 lanes, which would be compatible with the configuration of the El Chaparral LPOE on the Mexican side of the border. All other proposed improvements of the Approved Project would also be constructed under this alternative.

Ten-lane Alternative

The Ten-lane Alternative would include the bi-directional pedestrian crossing facility, the modified Virginia Avenue transit center, ten southbound vehicular lanes with ten southbound inspection booths with an overhead canopy in the southbound roadway, ten vehicular inspection spaces with an overhead canopy in the southbound secondary inspection area, and other design modifications to the Approved Project. As the ten southbound lanes approach the border, they would divide into 19 lanes, which would be compatible with the configuration of the El Chaparral LPOE on the Mexican side of the border. All other proposed improvements of the Approved Project would also be constructed under this alternative.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative is included and analyzed to provide a baseline for comparison with impacts from the Project build alternatives, and also to satisfy federal requirements for analyzing "no action" under NEPA (40 CFR 1502.14(d)). Under the No Action Alternative, GSA would continue to implement the Approved Project that was analyzed as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS and approved in the ROD. None of the proposed modifications discussed in Section S.1 would be constructed, including the incorporation of northbound pedestrian crossings at the pedestrian crossing facility at Virginia Avenue, the changes to the development footprint of the Virginia Avenue Transit Facility, and the changes to the number of vehicular lanes and installation of inspection booths on the southbound roadway, and other design modifications.

S.4 REVISED PROJECT IMPACTS

Table S-1 summarizes Revised Project impacts and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for each alternative. Detailed discussion and analysis of Revised Project impacts are provided in Chapter 4.0 of this Draft SEIS. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are listed in Appendix A, Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures.

Table S-1
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Land Use and Community Issues			
Existing and Future Land Uses			
Consistent with existing and planned land uses in the San Ysidro Community Plan (SYCP) Area, and with zoning and land use designations.	Consistent with existing and planned land uses in the SYCP Area, and with zoning and land use designations.	Consistent with existing and planned land uses in the SYCP Area, and with zoning and land use designations.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans			
Consistent with relevant land use plans.	Consistent with relevant land use plans.	Consistent with relevant land use plans.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Parks and Recreational Facilities			
No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Community Character and Cohesion			
No impacts to community character or cohesion.	No impacts to community character or cohesion.	No impacts to community character or cohesion.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Parcel Acquisitions and Relocations			
No impacts related to parcel acquisitions or relocations. This alternative would not require any additional acquisitions and/or relocations that were not previously evaluated and addressed in the Final EIS.	No impacts related to parcel acquisitions or relocations. This alternative would not require any additional acquisitions and/or relocations that were not previously evaluated and addressed in the Final EIS.	No impacts related to relocation of six on-site businesses, because property acquisitions in progress are following guidelines of the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Environmental Justice			
No adverse environmental justice impacts would be anticipated because the Revised Project has been developed in compliance with EO 12898.	No adverse environmental justice impacts would be anticipated because the Revised Project has been developed in compliance with EO 12898.	No adverse environmental justice impacts would be anticipated because the Revised Project has been developed in compliance with EO 12898.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children			
No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety			
Utilities			
Temporary construction-related utilities impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related utilities impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related utilities impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: ▪ The construction contractor should coordinate with responsible utility providers to protect systems in place or arrange for the temporary or permanent relocation of existing utility lines.
Emergency Services			
Temporary construction-related impacts to emergency services could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related impacts to emergency services could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related impacts to emergency services could potentially occur during construction.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: ▪ A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) should be implemented to provide for emergency access on roadways that would be temporarily affected during the construction period. ▪ The construction contractor should contact local emergency service providers prior to the start of construction to ensure construction activities would not impede provision of emergency services within the Project area during the construction period.
Life Safety			
No impacts to life safety with implementation of protective design measures.	No impacts to life safety with implementation of protective design measures.	No impacts to life safety with implementation of protective design measures.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: ▪ Bollards and barriers should be used to protect structural elements from vehicle damage. Anti-ram barriers must be provided wherever moving vehicles approach booths or buildings. ▪ Exterior walls and interior walls in high-risk areas, such as lobbies and public screening spaces, should be reinforced with cast-in-place or precast reinforced concrete. ▪ Exterior windows and interior windows between high-risk areas and occupied space should be thermally tempered or laminated glass. ▪ Bullet resistant glazing should be provided on windows that face inspection areas, on-coming traffic, or the border. ▪ Building perimeters and doors between inspection areas should be designed to resist forced entry. ▪ Utilities critical to LPOE operations should be located within the Central Plant building, which would be structurally reinforced. ▪ Where utilities are located within occupied buildings they should be separated from inspection and public lobby areas by at least 25 feet or by reinforced walls and floors. ▪ Air intakes should be secured.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety (cont.)			
Life Safety (cont.)			
			▪ Mechanical equipment should not be placed at grade and directly adjacent to vehicle movement pathways. ▪ Utilities and feeders should not be located adjacent to vehicle pathways, or on the Mexican side of the primary inspection lanes.
Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities			
Roadways and Intersections			
Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between the I-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ East San Ysidro Boulevard/Camino de la Plaza/Beyer Boulevard ▪ Camino de la Plaza/ Virginia Avenue	Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between the I-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ East San Ysidro Boulevard/Camino de la Plaza/Beyer Boulevard ▪ Camino de la Plaza/ Virginia Avenue	Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to intersections under near-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue ▪ Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps	<u>Six-lane Alternative and Ten-lane Alternative</u>: A primary Project goal in support of the Project purpose is to increase the processing capacity and efficiency of the LPOE in response to the need that is created by the current and projected demand for vehicles and persons to cross the border. Thus, the Six-lane Alternative or Ten-lane Alternative does not directly generate a substantial volume of traffic, but would accommodate existing and projected border crossing demand. They would also modify the patterns of traffic flow in the Project area. The purpose and need for the Revised Project does not include local roadway improvements; however, feasible improvements have been identified that may be implemented by others to achieve acceptable LOS, based on commonly accepted local roadway segment and intersection standards. These potential improvements to be implemented by others are described below. Implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measure would avoid or reduce traffic impacts to roadway segments for near-term conditions: ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps, to Four-Lane Collector standards. In addition to the measures listed above under near-term conditions, implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures would avoid or reduce traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections for long-term year conditions: ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between the I-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard, to Four-Lane Major standards. ▪ Widening of Camino de la Plaza to provide an additional dedicated right-turn lane onto East San Ysidro Boulevard. ▪ Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts of the Project			**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (cont.)			
Roadways and Intersections (cont.)			
		Traffic impacts to freeway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Northbound I-5, between the international border and East San Ysidro Boulevard ▪ Northbound I-5, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-805 interchange ▪ Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard	▪ Re-striping of the northbound approach of Camino de la Plaza to provide one shared left-turn/through lane and a dedicated right-turn lane with an overlap phase, and widening the southbound approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane. No Action Alternative: A primary Project goal in support of the Project purpose is to increase the processing capacity and efficiency of the LPOE in response to the need that is created by the current and projected demand for vehicles and persons to cross the border. Thus, the No Action Alternative does not directly generate a substantial volume of traffic, but would accommodate existing and projected border crossing demand. It would also modify the patterns of traffic flow in the Project area. The purpose and need for the Approved Project does not include local roadway improvements; however, feasible improvements have been identified that may be implemented by others to achieve acceptable LOS, based on commonly accepted local roadway segment and intersection standards. These potential improvements to be implemented by others are described below. Implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measure would avoid or reduce traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections for near-term conditions: ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps, to Four-Lane Major standards. ▪ Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection. In addition to the measures listed above under near-term conditions, implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures would avoid or reduce traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections for long-term year conditions: ▪ Re-striping of the I-5 southbound ramps at Camino de la Plaza to one southbound left-turn lane, one southbound right-turn lane, one southbound shared through/right-turn lane, and one westbound through lane.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (cont.)			
Roadways and Intersections (cont.)			
			Adverse traffic impacts to three northbound freeway segments under long-term conditions would occur. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures were identified to lessen these impacts; however, the benefits of reducing congestion (wait times and vehicle queues) for northbound vehicles crossing the border would offset these impacts.
Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities			
No impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.	No impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.	No impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Temporary Construction Impacts			
Temporary construction-related traffic impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related traffic impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related traffic impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Temporary impacts would be avoided with implementation of a TMP.
Parking Impacts			
No adverse parking impacts would occur.	No adverse parking impacts would occur.	No adverse parking impacts would occur.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
Visual/Aesthetics			
No adverse visual impacts would occur.	No adverse visual impacts would occur.	No adverse visual impacts would occur.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Although no adverse visual impacts would occur, implementation of the following minimization measures would provide increased visual quality within the Project area: ▪ A comprehensive landscape concept plan should be developed and implemented, including landscape features such as: o Drought tolerant and sustainable plant palettes. o Vine planting at fences and walls to reduce the visual scale and to act as a graffiti deterrent. ▪ Street trees and landscaping should be retained to the highest extent possible during Project construction. ▪ Architectural treatments should be consistent throughout the proposed LPOE buildings. ▪ Metal fencing and safety railing should be consistent throughout the proposed pedestrian walkways. ▪ Where possible, integrate new public art consistent with the international border setting.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Cultural Resources			
Archaeological Resources			
No impacts to archaeological resources are expected to occur, although unknown subsurface resources could be subject to disturbance during construction.	No impacts to archaeological resources are expected to occur, although unknown subsurface resources could be subject to disturbance during construction.	No impacts to archaeological resources are expected to occur, although unknown subsurface resources could be subject to disturbance during construction.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: ▪ If cultural materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area should be avoided until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.
Historical Resources			
Renovation of the NRHP-listed Old Customs House would result in an adverse direct impact to this historical property.	Renovation of the NRHP-listed Old Customs House would result in an adverse direct impact to this historical property.	Renovation of the NRHP-listed Old Customs House would result in an adverse direct impact to this historical property. The No Action Alternative would indirectly impact the International Building, which is recommended eligible to the NRHP, CRHP, and City Register.	Six-lane Alternative and Ten-lane Alternative: The following measures would avoid, minimize, or mitigate direct impacts to historical resources during renovation of the Old Customs House: ▪ All renovation of the Old Customs House should conform to *The* Secretary *of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. ▪ Prior to alteration or removal of building features, detailed documentation of the Old Customs House should be completed as agreed to in the Section 106 consultation process. If all adverse effects cannot be avoided, then other mitigation measures will be determined through Section 106 consultation. No Action Alternative: The following measures would avoid, minimize, or mitigate direct impacts to historical resources during renovation of the Old Customs House: ▪ All renovation of the Old Customs House should conform to *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. ▪ Prior to alteration or removal of building features, detailed documentation of the Old Customs House should be completed as agreed to in the Section 106 consultation process. If all adverse effects cannot be avoided, then other mitigation measures will be determined through Section 106 consultation. The following measure would avoid, minimize, or mitigate indirect impacts to the International Building: ▪ Measures consistent with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* would be implemented as agreed to in the Section 106 consultation process.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Hydrology and Floodplain			
No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and Best Management Practices (BMPs).	No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and BMPs.	No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and BMPs.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Recommendations to effectively avoid or address potential impacts related to hydrology and floodplain issues include BMPs with respect to appropriate design, sizing, and location of proposed storm drain facilities, incorporation of applicable recommendations from detailed geotechnical investigations, and consideration of the location and extent of proposed retention/infiltration basins with respect to potential surficial saturation issues.
Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff			
No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and BMPs.	No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and BMPs.	No short-term construction or long-term operational impacts with appropriate design and BMPs.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Water quality and stormwater runoff impacts would be addressed through conformance with the applicable NPDES Construction Permit, Municipal Permit and related City standards. Associated BMPs and the Project SWPPP would define measures to address potential effects associated with short-term construction (erosion and sedimentation, construction-related hazardous materials, demolition-related debris generation, and disposal of extracted groundwater) and long-term operation and maintenance (site design/low impact development BMPs, source control BMPs, treatment control BMPs, and post-construction BMP monitoring/maintenance schedules and responsibilities).
Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography			
No seismic or non-seismic impacts with compliance with Department standards, International Building Code (IBC), and California Building Code (CBC), and incorporation of geotechnical recommendations.	No seismic or non-seismic impacts with compliance with Department standards, IBC, and CBC, and incorporation of geotechnical recommendations.	No seismic or non-seismic impacts with compliance with Department standards, IBC, and CBC, and incorporation of geotechnical recommendations.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Would incorporate appropriate design and construction measures to accommodate potential seismic and non-seismic hazards, if applicable, pursuant to associated industry/regulatory standards (e.g., the IBC) and subsequent detailed geotechnical analysis.
Paleontology			
Could potentially affect previously undisturbed portions of the high sensitivity Otay Formation and Old Paralic Deposits, potentially resulting in the destruction of unique or significant paleontological resources.	Could potentially affect previously undisturbed portions of the high sensitivity Otay Formation and Old Paralic Deposits, potentially resulting in the destruction of unique or significant paleontological resources.	Could potentially affect previously undisturbed portions of the high sensitivity Otay Formation and Old Paralic Deposits, potentially resulting in the destruction of unique or significant paleontological resources.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Would prepare and implement a Paleontological Monitoring Plan, which would likely include the following types of measures in accordance with standard construction practices in southern California: ▪ A Qualified Paleontologist should be present at pre-grading meetings to consult with grading/excavation contractors regarding the potential location and nature of paleontological resources and associated monitoring/recovery operations. ▪ A Qualified Paleontologist or Paleontological Monitor (working under the direction of the Qualified Paleontologist), should be on site to monitor for paleontological resources during all original grading/excavation activities involving previously undisturbed areas of the Otay Formation and/or Old Paralic Deposits.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Paleontology (cont.)			
			▪ If paleontological resources are discovered, the Qualified Paleontologist (or Paleontological Monitor) should implement appropriate salvage operations, potentially including simple excavation, plaster-jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens, or quarry excavations for richly fossiliferous deposits. The Qualified Paleontologist and Paleontological Resources Monitor should be authorized to halt or divert construction work in salvage areas to allow for the timely recovery of fossil remains. ▪ Paleontological resources collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program should be cleaned, repaired, sorted, and cataloged pursuant to accepted industry methods. ▪ Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos and maps, should be deposited in an approved scientific institution with paleontological collections. ▪ A final report should be prepared by the Qualified Paleontologist to describe the results of the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methods, stratigraphic units encountered, and the nature and significance of recovered paleontological resources.
Hazardous Waste/Materials			
Would result in potential adverse impacts due to possible soil and/or groundwater contamination at listed facilities of potential environmental concern, and former and current uses within the Revised Project Footprint and LPOE. Additionally, potential adverse impacts could occur associated with aerially deposited lead (ADL), hazardous building materials, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).	Would result in potential adverse impacts due to possible soil and/or groundwater contamination at listed facilities of potential environmental concern, and former and current uses within the Revised Project Footprint and LPOE. Additionally, potential adverse impacts could occur associated with ADL, hazardous building materials, and PCBs.	Would result in potential adverse impacts due to possible soil and/or groundwater contamination at listed facilities of potential environmental concern, and former and current uses within the Project Study Area and LPOE. Additionally, potential adverse impacts could occur associated with ADL, hazardous building materials, and PCBs.	<u>Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative</u>: ▪ Soil sampling should be conducted in areas within the Revised Project Footprint proposed to be disturbed and/or excavated prior to soil export, reuse, or disposal to characterize the soil for the presence of hazardous materials (e.g., metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, pesticides, etc.). If contaminated soil is present, appropriate abatement actions should be implemented in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. ▪ Health risk assessments should be conducted for facilities within the LPOE in which contamination has been documented to evaluate whether the levels of contaminants would pose a risk to human health. ▪ Prior to commencement of excavation activities, a Site and Community Health and Safety Plan should be prepared to manage potential health and safety hazards to workers and the public.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts of the Project			**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Hazardous Waste/Materials (cont.)			
			▪ Prior to commencement of excavation activities, a Soil Management Plan should be prepared to address the notification, monitoring, sampling, testing, handling, storage, and disposal of contaminated media or substances that may be encountered during construction activities. ▪ Prior to commencement of excavation activities, a Groundwater Management Plan should be prepared to address the notification, monitoring, sampling, testing, handling, storage, and disposal of potentially contaminated groundwater. ▪ Existing transformers and elevator equipment within the Revised Project Footprint should be sampled for PCB content if proposed to be disturbed and/or moved during construction activities. If PCBs are present, appropriate abatement actions for their disposal should be implemented in accordance with regulatory requirements, and soil beneath transformers and/or elevators should be evaluated for evidence of releases. If present in underlying soils, appropriate abatement actions for removal and disposal should be implemented in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. ▪ Wastes and potentially hazardous waste within the Revised Project Footprint, including trash, debris piles, and equipment, should be removed and recycled and/or disposed of offsite, in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. ▪ Prior to renovation or demolition of existing structures, surveys should be conducted to evaluate the presence, locations, and quantities of hazardous building materials (ACMs and LCSs). Suspect materials should be sampled and analyzed, and if present, appropriate abatement actions should be implemented in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. ▪ Contract specifications should include references to the potential to encounter contaminated soil, groundwater, or other regulated wastes during construction activities.
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
No adverse construction or operational air quality or greenhouse gas impacts would occur. No adverse air quality impacts related to Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) would occur.	No adverse construction or operational air quality or greenhouse gas impacts would occur. No adverse air quality impacts related to MSATs would occur.	No adverse construction or operational air quality or greenhouse gas impacts would occur. No adverse air quality impacts related MSATs would occur.	<u>Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative</u>: Although no adverse air quality impacts would occur, implementation of the following minimization measures would minimize air pollution emissions during construction: ▪ Suspend grading and earth moving when wind gusts exceed 25 mph unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes. ▪ Cover trucks when hauling loose material.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts of the Project			**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (cont.)			
			▪ Stabilize the surface of materials stockpiles if not removed immediately. ▪ Limit vehicular paths on unpaved surfaces and stabilize any temporary roads. ▪ Trucks should be washed off as they leave the construction site(s), as necessary, to control fugitive dust emissions. ▪ Track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads should be used at access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic. ▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained. Low sulfur fuel should be used in all construction equipment. ▪ Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities. ▪ Sweep paved streets at least once per day where there is evidence of dirt that has been carried on to the roadway. ▪ Revegetate disturbed land, including vehicular paths created during construction to avoid future off-road vehicular activities. ▪ Locate construction equipment and truck staging and maintenance areas as far as feasible and nominally downwind of schools, active recreation areas, and other areas of high population density. ▪ To the extent feasible, construction traffic should be routed and scheduled to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads during peak travel times. ▪ Provide landscaping where possible, which reduces surface warming and decreases CO2 through photosynthesis. ▪ Use lighter color surfaces, such as Portland cement, which helps to increase the albedo effect (i.e., surface reflectivity of the sun's radiation) and cool the surface. ▪ Use of energy efficient lighting.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Energy			
Potential short-term, construction-related energy impacts could occur during construction. No adverse operational energy impacts would occur. Energy consumption would not be excessive and would be reduced by achieving a LEED certification for the LPOE, as is currently planned, as well as compliance with the Energy Independence and Security Act.	Potential short-term, construction-related energy impacts could occur during construction. No adverse operational energy impacts would occur. Energy consumption would not be excessive and would be reduced by achieving a LEED certification for the LPOE, as is currently planned, as well as compliance with the Energy Independence and Security Act.	Potential short-term, construction-related energy impacts could occur during construction. No adverse operational energy impacts would occur. Energy consumption would not be excessive and would be reduced by achieving a LEED certification for the LPOE, as is currently planned, as well as compliance with the Energy Independence and Security Act.	<u>Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative</u>: ▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained. ▪ Idling times of construction equipment should be minimized, to the extent practical. ▪ To the extent feasible, construction traffic should be routed and scheduled to reduce congestion and related energy impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads during peak travel times.
Biological Resources			
No impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, sensitive plant species, or sensitive animal species would occur. Impacts 0.08 acre of non-wetland WUS would occur. Potential for indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality.	Impacts to 0.02 acre of disturbed wetland would occur. No other impacts to sensitive habitat would occur. No impacts to sensitive plant or animal species would occur. Impacts to 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS would occur. Potential for indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality.	No impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, sensitive plant species, or sensitive animal species would occur. Impacts 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS would occur. Potential for indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality.	<u>Six-lane Alternative:</u> ▪ Prior to the commencement of construction, jurisdictional areas and sensitive vegetation within the Revised Project BSA should be fenced with orange plastic exclusionary fencing, and no personnel, debris, or equipment would be allowed within the jurisdictional areas. ▪ Impacts to 0.08 acre of non-wetland WUS should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through purchase of mitigation credits equal to 0.08 acre of ephemeral drainage at an approved mitigation bank. ▪ If removal of habitat and/or construction activities is necessary adjacent to nesting habitat during the bird breeding season (January 15 to September 15), the GSA shall retain an approved biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of: (1) non-listed nesting migratory birds on, or within, 100 feet of the construction area; (2) Federally- or State-listed birds on, or within, 300 feet of the construction area; and (3) nesting raptors within 500 feet of the construction area. The pre-construction survey will be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction. The results of the survey will be submitted to the GSA for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts of the Project			**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Biological Resources (cont.)			
			▪ If nesting birds are detected by the approved biologist, the following buffers will be established: (1) no work will occur within 100 feet of a non-listed nesting migratory bird nest; (2) no work will occur within 300 feet of a listed bird nest; and (3) no work will occur within 500 feet of a raptor nest. If construction within these buffers cannot be avoided, GSA, in consultation with the resource agencies, will determine the appropriate buffer. Potential indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality would be addressed through the measures identified above under Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff. <u>Ten-lane Alternative</u>: ▪ Prior to the commencement of construction, jurisdictional areas and sensitive vegetation within the Revised Project BSA should be fenced with orange plastic exclusionary fencing, and no personnel, debris, or equipment would be allowed within the jurisdictional areas. ▪ Impacts to 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through purchase of mitigation credits equal to 0.08 acre of ephemeral drainage at an approved mitigation bank. ▪ Impacts to 0.02 acre of disturbed wetland should be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through a combination of creation, restoration, enhancement, and acquisition (at an approved mitigation bank) of 0.04 acre of wetlands. ▪ If removal of habitat and/or construction activities is necessary adjacent to nesting habitat during the bird breeding season (January 15 to September 15), the GSA shall retain an approved biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of: (1) non-listed nesting migratory birds on, or within, 100 feet of the construction area; (2) Federally- or State-listed birds on, or within, 300 feet of the construction area; and (3) nesting raptors within 500 feet of the construction area. The pre-construction survey will be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction. The results of the survey will be submitted to the GSA for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES			
Potential Impacts of the Project			**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Biological Resources (cont.)			
			▪ If nesting birds are detected by the approved biologist, the following buffers will be established: (1) no work will occur within 100 feet of a non-listed nesting migratory bird nest; (2) no work will occur within 300 feet of a listed bird nest; and (3) no work will occur within 500 feet of a raptor nest. If construction within these buffers cannot be avoided, GSA, in consultation with the resource agencies, will determine the appropriate buffer. Potential indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality would be addressed through the measures identified above under Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff. <u>No Action Alternative</u>: ▪ Prior to the commencement of construction, jurisdictional areas and sensitive vegetation within the BSA should be fenced with orange plastic exclusionary fencing, and no personnel, debris, or equipment would be allowed within the jurisdictional areas. ▪ Impacts to 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through purchase of mitigation credits equal to 0.07 acre of ephemeral drainage at an approved mitigation bank. ▪ If removal of habitat and/or construction activities is necessary adjacent to nesting habitat during the bird breeding season (January 15 to September 15), the GSA shall retain an approved biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of: (1) non-listed nesting migratory birds on, or within, 100 feet of the construction area; (2) Federally- or State-listed birds on, or within, 300 feet of the construction area; and (3) nesting raptors within 500 feet of the construction area. The pre-construction survey will be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction. The results of the survey will be submitted to the GSA for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Biological Resources (cont.)			
			▪ If nesting birds are detected by the approved biologist, the following buffers will be established: (1) no work will occur within 100 feet of a non-listed nesting migratory bird nest; (2) no work will occur within 300 feet of a listed bird nest; and (3) no work will occur within 500 feet of a raptor nest. If construction within these buffers cannot be avoided, GSA, in consultation with the resource agencies, will determine the appropriate buffer. Potential indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality would be addressed through the measures identified above under Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff.
Cumulative Impacts			
Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities			
Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between the I-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ East San Ysidro Boulevard/Camino de la Plaza/Beyer Boulevard ▪ Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue	Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between the I-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ East San Ysidro Boulevard/Camino de la Plaza/Beyer Boulevard ▪ Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue	Traffic impacts to roadway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to intersections under long-term conditions: ▪ Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue ▪ Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps Traffic impacts to freeway segments under long-term conditions: ▪ Northbound I-5, between the international border and East San Ysidro Boulevard	<u>Six-lane Alternative and Ten-lane Alternative</u>: A primary Project goal in support of the Revised Project purpose is to increase the processing capacity and efficiency of the LPOE in response to the need that is created by the current and projected demand for vehicles and persons to cross the border. Thus, the Six-lane Alternative or Ten-lane Alternative does not directly generate a substantial volume of traffic, but would accommodate existing and projected border crossing demand. They would also modify the patterns of traffic flow in the Project area. The purpose and need for the Revised Project does not include local roadway improvements; however, feasible improvements have been identified that may be implemented by others to achieve acceptable LOS, based on commonly accepted local roadway segment and intersection standards. These potential improvements to be implemented by others are described below. ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps, to Four-Lane Collector standards. ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between the 1-5 southbound ramps and East San Ysidro Boulevard, to Four-Lane Major standards. ▪ Widening of Camino de la Plaza to provide an additional dedicated right-turn lane onto East San Ysidro Boulevard. ▪ Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection. ▪ Re-striping of the northbound approach of Camino de la Plaza to provide one shared left-turn/through lane and a dedicated right-turn lane with an overlap phase, and widening the southbound approach to provide one exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Cumulative Impacts			
Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities			
		▪ Northbound I-5, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-805 interchange ▪ Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard	No Action Alternative: A primary Project goal in support of the Project purpose is to increase the processing capacity and efficiency of the LPOE in response to the need that is created by the current and projected demand for vehicles and persons to cross the border. Thus, the No Action Alternative does not directly generate a substantial volume of traffic, but would accommodate existing and projected border crossing demand. It would also modify the patterns of traffic flow in the Project area. The purpose and need for the Approved Project does not include local roadway improvements; however, feasible improvements have been identified that may be implemented by others to achieve acceptable LOS, based on commonly accepted local roadway segment and intersection standards. These potential improvements to be implemented by others are described below. Implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measure would avoid or reduce cumulative traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections: ▪ Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps, to Four-Lane Major standards. ▪ Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection. ▪ Re-striping of the I-5 southbound ramps at Camino de la Plaza to one southbound left-turn lane, one southbound right-turn lane, one southbound shared through/right-turn lane, and one westbound through lane. Adverse traffic impacts to three northbound freeway segments under long-term conditions would occur. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures were identified to lessen these impacts; however, the benefits of reducing congestion (wait times and vehicle queues) for northbound vehicles crossing the border would offset these impacts.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
Six-lane Alternative	**Ten-lane Alternative**	**No Action Alternative**	
Air Quality			
No adverse cumulative operational air quality or greenhouse gas impacts would occur. Potential adverse cumulative construction air quality impacts could occur if multiple projects within the SYCP Area are under construction at the same time.	No adverse cumulative operational air quality or greenhouse gas impacts would occur. Potential adverse cumulative construction air quality impacts could occur if multiple projects within the SYCP Area are under construction at the same time.	No adverse cumulative operational or global climate change impacts would occur. Potential adverse cumulative air quality construction impacts could occur if multiple projects within the SYCP Area are under construction at the same time.	Six-lane Alternative, Ten-lane Alternative, and No Action Alternative: Although no adverse air quality impacts would occur, implementation of the following minimization measures would minimize air pollution emissions during construction: ▪ Suspend grading and earth moving when wind gusts exceed 25 mph unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes. ▪ Cover trucks when hauling loose material. ▪ Stabilize the surface of materials stockpiles if not removed immediately. ▪ Limit vehicular paths on unpaved surfaces and stabilize any temporary roads. ▪ Trucks should be washed off as they leave the construction site(s), as necessary, to control fugitive dust emissions. ▪ Track-out reduction measures such as gravel pads should be used at access points to minimize dust and mud deposits on roads affected by construction traffic. ▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained. Low sulfur fuel should be used in all construction equipment. ▪ Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities. ▪ Sweep paved streets at least once per day where there is evidence of dirt that has been carried on to the roadway. ▪ Revegetate disturbed land, including vehicular paths created during construction to avoid future off-road vehicular activities. ▪ Locate construction equipment and truck staging and maintenance areas as far as feasible and nominally downwind of schools, active recreation areas, and other areas of high population density. ▪ To the extent feasible, construction traffic should be routed and scheduled to reduce congestion and related air quality impacts caused by idling vehicles along local roads during peak travel times. ▪ Provide landscaping where possible, which reduces surface warming and decreases CO_2 through photosynthesis. ▪ Use lighter color surfaces, such as Portland cement, which helps to increase the albedo effect (i.e., surface reflectivity of the sun's radiation) and cool the surface. ▪ Use of energy efficient lighting.

S.5 COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AND OTHER AGENCIES

Permits and Approvals Needed

Permits and approvals that would be required for the Revised Project would be the same as those identified in the Final EIS for the Approved Project, and are listed below. Those required for the proposed modifications that comprise the Revised Project (in addition to the other elements of the Approved Project that have not changed) are indicated by an asterisk.

- Presidential Permit from the U.S. Department of State
- Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Construction Activity Permit* from the State Water Resources Control Board
- General Groundwater Extraction Waste Discharge Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Permits to Operate emergency generators from the San Diego Air Pollution Control District
- Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, pursuant to the National Historic Properties Act
- GSA Public Buildings Service Commissioner approval of Revised Project design*
- Temporary Construction Easement* from the California Department of Transportation*
- Temporary Construction Easement and Permanent Easement* from the City of San Diego*

Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies

GSA consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on biological resource issues for the Approved Project and for the Revised Project. The USFWS Carlsbad Field Office was contacted in February 2009 to request USFWS's assessment for potential presence of federally listed threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing species. In June 2013, USFWS was again contacted to request comparable information for the additional area incorporated into the Revised Project footprint.

GSA will also coordinate with the US Army Corps of Engineers for any required permits.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a records search of their Sacred Lands files in December 2008. The results of the search indicated that no sacred lands are recorded in or adjacent to the Approved Project area. Consultation with local Native American tribes was recommended, and a list of Native American contacts was provided. Letters describing the Approved Project and a map of the study area were mailed to local Native American representatives in January 2009. In May of 2013 the NAHC was again contacted, requesting a search of their Sacred Lands File for the additional Area of Potential Effect (APE) included in the Revised Project footprint. The results of this search indicated that no known sacred lands or traditional cultural properties are located within the additional APE associated with the Revised Project. Again, a list of Native American tribes and individuals to contact

regarding the Project was provided. On May 20, 2013, letters were sent to each of the individuals and tribes listed by the NAHC. To date, no responses have been received.

Per Section 106 of the NHPA, GSA consulted with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, for the Approved Project, and will continue to consult with the SHPO for the Revised Project.

Ongoing coordination between GSA and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has occurred regarding the design of Revised Project. Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), SANDAG, and the City of San Diego have also been consulted in regards to the Revised Project and its interface with transportation and community facilities. Additionally, GSA coordinated with the U.S. Department of State to obtain a Presidential Permit for the Approved Project; this Presidential Permit would also apply to the Revised Project.

Public Participation

Pursuant to NEPA, a Notice of Intent (NOI) was prepared for the Revised Project and published in Vol. 78, No. 84 of the *Federal Register* on Wednesday, May 1, 2013. The NOI invited agencies and the public to submit comments regarding the scope of the SEIS. A public scoping meeting was held on May 9, 2013 from 4:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at The Front, located at 147 West San Ysidro Boulevard, San Ysidro, CA 92173, to give the community an opportunity to review and comment on the Revised Project. The notice for the scoping meeting was published in the *Federal Register* as part of the NOI on May 1, 2013; in the *San Diego Union Tribune* in English (April 25, 2013); and in its companion publication, *Enlace*, in Spanish (April 27, 2013). Approximately 35 people attended the scoping meeting. Comments were encouraged, and comment cards were made available at the meeting; Spanish interpretation was also made available. During the public comment period for the scoping process (May 9, 2013 through June 9, 2013), which included the public scoping meeting, comment forms, letters and e-mails were received from a total of 12 commenters.

In addition to the public scoping process, GSA formed a Community Representative Committee (CRC) in 2004, which is comprised of key community representatives and stakeholders. GSA held CRC meetings regularly during the environmental and design phases of the Approved Project. GSA has continued to periodically host CRC meetings to provide updates on the design and construction of the Approved Project, and to discuss and solicit input on the proposed Revised Project modifications. In particular, GSA initiated a collaborative effort with local stakeholders and public agencies to develop a concept for the proposed Virginia Avenue Transit Facility, and has continued to coordinate with local public agencies (including SANDAG, MTS, and the City) with regard to this proposed facility.

GSA also provides information on the status and schedule of LPOE improvements on their website at: http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/21521.