

# San Ysidro Land Port of Entry Improvements Project

San Ysidro, California

## Final Environmental Impact Statement Volume I



Prepared by the  
United States General Services Administration



August 2009

## GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) proposes the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (LPOE). The San Ysidro LPOE is located along Interstate 5 at the U.S.-Mexico border in the San Ysidro community of San Diego, California. The GSA has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which examines the reason the Project is being proposed; alternatives for the Project; the existing environment that could be affected by the Project; the potential impacts resulting from each of the alternatives; and the proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures. It is based on the associated technical studies and input received during the public comment period, and was prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Comments on the Draft EIS were accepted through the end of the 45-day comment period (through June 22, 2009), which commenced with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's publication of the *Federal Register* Notice of Availability for this document on May 8, 2009. Comments were accepted in writing and by electronic mail to the GSA at the address, phone number, and email listed below.

This Final EIS contains:

- A line in the margin to indicate where changes between the draft and final document have occurred;
- Any revised graphics indicated by the inclusion of the word "revised" in their title;
- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the Draft EIS during the circulation period;
- Copies of comments received in response to the Draft EIS; and,
- GSA's responses to substantive environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.

After a final 30-day review period, which will commence with the publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*, GSA may (1) give environmental approval to the Project, (2) undertake additional environmental studies, or (3) abandon the Project. If the Project is given environmental approval and funding is appropriated, GSA could design and construct all or part of the Project. A decision by GSA on this Project would be documented in a Record of Decision (ROD).

It should be noted that at a future date, GSA may publish a notice in the *Federal Register*, pursuant to 23 USC §139(l), indicating that GSA has taken a final action on this Project. If such notice is published, a lawsuit or other legal claim would be barred unless it is filed within 30 days after the date of publication of the notice (or within such shorter time period as is specified in the federal laws pursuant to which judicial review of the federal agency action is allowed). If no notice is published, then the lawsuit or claim can be filed as long as the periods of time provided by other federal laws that govern claims are met.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document can be made available in alternate formats. To obtain a copy in an alternate format, please call or write to the phone number, address or e-mail listed below.

**For further information concerning this Final EIS, contact:**

Mr. Osmahn Kadri  
NEPA Project Manager  
Portfolio Management Division (9PTC)  
U.S. General Services Administration  
450 Golden Gate Ave  
San Francisco CA, 94102  
[Osmahn.Kadri@gsa.gov](mailto:Osmahn.Kadri@gsa.gov)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
SUMMARY	.....	S-1
CHAPTER 1.0 – PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT	.....	1-1
1.1	Introduction .....	1-1
1.2	Purpose and Need .....	1-1
1.2.1	Purpose of the Project .....	1-1
1.2.2	Need for the Project.....	1-1
1.3	Existing Facilities .....	1-3
CHAPTER 2.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	.....	2-1
2.1	Project Description.....	2-1
2.1.1	Preferred Alternative.....	2-1
2.1.2	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative .....	2-7
2.1.3	No Build Alternative .....	2-9
2.2	Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion.....	2-9
2.2.1	Freeway Realignment Alternative.....	2-9
2.3	Permits and Approvals Needed .....	2-10
CHAPTER 3.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT; ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES; AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES	.....	3.1-1
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT		
3.1	Land Use .....	3.1-2
3.1.1	Existing and Future Land Use .....	3.1-2
3.1.2	Consistency with State, Regional and Local Plans .....	3.1-8
3.1.3	Parks and Recreational Facilities .....	3.1-21
3.2	Community Impacts .....	3.2-1
3.2.1	Community Character and Cohesion .....	3.2-1
3.2.2	Relocations.....	3.2-14
3.2.3	Environmental Justice and Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children .....	3.2-19

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 3.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT; ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES; AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES (cont.)		
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT (cont.)		
3.3	Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety .....	3.3-1
3.3.1	Affected Environment .....	3.3-1
3.3.2	Environmental Consequences.....	3.3-2
3.3.3	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.3-4
3.4	Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities .....	3.4-1
3.4.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.4-1
3.4.2	Affected Environment .....	3.4-1
3.4.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.4-8
3.4.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.4-22
3.5	Visual/Aesthetics .....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Affected Environment .....	3.5-1
3.5.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.5-10
3.5.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.5-18
3.6	Cultural Resources .....	3.6-1
3.6.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.6-1
3.6.2	Affected Environment .....	3.6-2
3.6.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.6-6
3.6.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.6-8
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT		
3.7	Hydrology and Floodplain .....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.7-1
3.7.2	Affected Environment .....	3.7-2
3.7.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.7-4
3.7.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.7-6

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 3.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT; ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES; AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES (cont.)		
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT (cont.)		
3.8	Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff .....	3.8-1
3.8.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.8-1
3.8.2	Affected Environment .....	3.8-4
3.8.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.8-6
3.8.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.8-8
3.9	Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography .....	3.9-1
3.9.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.9-1
3.9.2	Affected Environment .....	3.9-1
3.9.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.9-4
3.9.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.9-7
3.10	Paleontology .....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.10-1
3.10.2	Affected Environment .....	3.10-1
3.10.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.10-1
3.10.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.10-2
3.11	Hazardous Waste/Materials.....	3.11-1
3.11.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.11-1
3.11.2	Affected Environment .....	3.11-1
3.11.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.11-5
3.11.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.11-8
3.12	Air Quality .....	3.12-1
3.12.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.12-1
3.12.2	Affected Environment .....	3.12-3
3.12.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.12-5
3.12.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Abatement Measures .....	3.12-20
3.13	Energy .....	3.13-1
3.13.1	Regulatory Setting .....	3.13-1
3.13.2	Affected Environment .....	3.13-1
3.13.3	Environmental Consequences.....	3.13-2
3.13.4	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.13-3

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 3.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT; ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES; AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES (cont.)		
BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT		
3.14	Biological Resources .....	3.14-1
	3.14.1 Regulatory Setting .....	3.14-1
	3.14.2 Affected Environment .....	3.14-2
	3.14.3 Environmental Consequences.....	3.14-4
	3.14.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.14-7
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS		
3.15	Relationship Between Local Short-term Uses of the Human Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity .....	3.15-1
	3.15.1 Preferred Alternative.....	3.15-1
	3.15.2 Pedestrian Crossing Alternative .....	3.15-2
	3.15.3 No Build Alternative .....	3.15-2
3.16	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources that would be Involved in the Project.....	3.16-1
	3.16.1 Preferred Alternative.....	3.16-1
	3.16.2 Pedestrian Crossing Alternative .....	3.16-1
	3.16.3 No Build Alternative .....	3.16-2
3.17	Cumulative Impacts .....	3.17-1
	3.17.1 Regulatory Setting .....	3.17-1
	3.17.2 Affected Environment .....	3.17-1
	3.17.3 Environmental Consequences.....	3.17-7
	3.17.4 Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures .....	3.17-12

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
CHAPTER 4.0 –	COMMENTS AND COORDINATION .....	4-1
4.1	Introduction .....	4-1
4.2	Public Scoping Process .....	4-1
4.2.1	Notice of Intent .....	4-1
4.2.2	Public Scoping Meeting .....	4-4
4.3	Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies.....	4-5
4.4	Public Participation .....	4-5
4.5	List of Persons, Organizations, and Public Agencies that Commented on the Draft EIS .....	4-6
CHAPTER 5.0 –	LIST OF PREPARERS.....	5-1
CHAPTER 6.0 –	DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	6-1
CHAPTER 7.0 –	REFERENCES .....	7-1

**APPENDICES**

- Appendix A: Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures
- Appendix B: List of Acronyms and Abbreviations
- Appendix C: List of Technical Studies

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		
<b><u>Table</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
S-1	Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase – Preferred Alternative	S-9
S-2	Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase – Pedestrian Crossing Alternative .....	S-11
S-3	Summary of Environmental Consequences and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures .....	S-12
2-1	Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase – Preferred Alternative	2-6
2-2	Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase – Pedestrian Crossing Alternative .....	2-8
3.1-1	Land Development and Public Projects in the SYCP Area .....	3.1-6
3.1-2	Parks within the SYCP Area .....	3.1-21
3.2-1	SYCP Area, South Bay SRA and San Diego County Population and Housing Characteristics .....	3.2-2
3.2-2	Acquisition of Privately Owned Parcels – Preferred Alternative .....	3.2-16
3.2-3	Estimated Property Tax Impacts for Taxable Parcels Acquired Under the Preferred Alternative .....	3.2-17
3.4-1	Existing Roadway Segment Conditions .....	3.4-4
3.4-2	Existing Freeway Conditions.....	3.4-5
3.4-3	Intersection LOS Definitions .....	3.4-6
3.4-4	Existing Intersection Conditions.....	3.4-6
3.4-5	Near-term (2014) Roadway Segment Conditions .....	3.4-8
3.4-6	Near-term (2014) Freeway Conditions.....	3.4-10
3.4-7	Near-term (2014) Intersection Conditions.....	3.4-11
3.4-8	Horizon Year (2030) Roadway Segment Conditions .....	3.4-12
3.4-9	Horizon Year (2030) Freeway Conditions.....	3.4-14
3.4-10	Horizon Year (2030) Intersection Conditions.....	3.4-15
3.6-1	Recorded Cultural and Historical Resources within or Adjacent to the APE .....	3.6-4
3.6-2	Evaluated Buildings and Structures within or Adjacent to the APE .....	3.6-5
3.8-1	Surface and Groundwater Quality Objectives for the Tijuana Valley Hydrologic Area .....	3.8-3
3.8-2	Summary of Typical/Proposed Post-construction BMP Monitoring and Maintenance Efforts .....	3.8-15
3.11-1	Observations During Site Reconnaissance .....	3.11-2
3.12-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3.12-2
3.12-2	Attainment Classification and Number of Air Quality Violations at the Nearest Monitoring Station.....	3.12-4
3.12-3	Ambient Background Concentrations .....	3.12-4
3.12-4	Annual Construction Emissions .....	3.12-6
3.12-5	Operational Emissions .....	3.12-7
3.12-6	CO “Hot Spots” Evaluation Near-term (2014) Conditions .....	3.12-10
3.12-7	CO “Hot Spots” Evaluation Horizon Year (2030) Conditions .....	3.12-10

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

### LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

<b><u>Table</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3.12-8	MSAT Emissions .....	3.12-15
3.12-9	Carbon Dioxide Emissions Versus Speed (Highway) .....	3.12-17
3.12-10	Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	3.12-18
3.14-1	Preferred Alternative Impacts to Vegetation Communities .....	3.14-5
3.14-2	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative Impacts to Vegetation Communities.....	3.14-6
3.17-1	Cumulative Projects in the SYCP Area.....	3.17-6

### LIST OF FIGURES

<b><u>Figure</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Follows Page</u></b>
1-1	Regional Location Map .....	1-4
1-2	Project Vicinity Map .....	1-4
1-3	Existing San Ysidro LPOE .....	1-4
2-1	Proposed Project – Site Plan .....	2-10
2-2	Phase 1 Improvements .....	2-10
2-3	Phase 2 Improvements .....	2-10
2-4	Phase 3 Improvements .....	2-10
2-5	Freeway Realignment Alternative .....	2-10
3.1-1	San Ysidro Community Plan Area Zoning Designations.....	3.1-22
3.1-2	Existing Land Uses in the Project Vicinity.....	3.1-22
3.1-3	Land Development and Public Projects in the SYCP Area (Revised) .....	3.1-22
3.2-1	Schools and Parks in the SYCP Area.....	3.2-22
3.2-2	Acquisition of Privately Owned Parcels .....	3.2-22
3.4-1	Traffic Study Area .....	3.4-24
3.4-2	Near-term Roadway Segment Conditions – Proposed Action .....	3.4-24
3.4-3	Near-term Peak Hour Intersection Conditions – Proposed Action.....	3.4-24
3.4-4	Horizon Year Roadway Segment Conditions – Proposed Action .....	3.4-24
3.4-5	Horizon Year Peak Hour Intersection Conditions – Proposed Action .....	3.4-24
3.5-1	Project Viewshed Map .....	3.5-18
3.5-2	Existing San Ysidro LPOE .....	3.5-18
3.5-3	Typical Views from I-5 .....	3.5-18
3.5-4	Typical Views from Local Roadways .....	3.5-18
3.5-5	Typical Views from Local Roadways .....	3.5-18
3.6-1	Evaluated Buildings and Structures Within or Adjacent to the APE.....	3.6-10

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

### LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

<b><u>Figure</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Follows Page</u></b>
3.7-1	Hydrology and Floodplain Study Area .....	3.7-6
3.7-2	Local Hydrologic Designations.....	3.7-6
3.9-1	Generalized Geologic Map .....	3.9-8
3.9-2	Regional Fault Map.....	3.9-8
3.11-1	Listed Facilities of Potential Environmental Concern.....	3.11-10
3.12-1	Receptor Sites for CO “Hot Spots” Analysis .....	3.12-22
3.14-1	Vegetation Communities and Corps Jurisdictional Areas .....	3.14-8
3.14-2	Vegetation – Phase 1 Impacts .....	3.14-8
3.14-3	Vegetation – Phase 2 Impacts .....	3.14-8
3.14-3	Vegetation – Phase 3 Impacts .....	3.14-8



## SUMMARY

## SUMMARY

The General Services Administration (GSA) has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) based on public comments received regarding the Draft EIS during the 45-day public review period (May 8 through June 22). Revisions to the draft document are indicated in this Final EIS by a line in the margin. Graphics that underwent updating for the Final EIS have been renamed to include the word “revised.”

### S.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT STUDY AREA

The GSA proposes the reconfiguration and expansion of the existing San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (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 San Diego, California. The proposed San Ysidro LPOE improvements are herein referred to as the “Project.”

The Project is located on the southern boundary of the San Ysidro Community Plan (SYCP) Area, which encompasses approximately 1,800 acres and is located about 14 miles southeast of Downtown San Diego. The SYCP Area is surrounded by the Tijuana River Valley to the west, State Route 905 (SR-905) and the Otay Mesa-Nestor community to the north, the Otay Mesa community to the east, and the U.S.-Mexico International Border to the south. The topography of the SYCP Area is mostly level, except for the northeast portion, which is dominated by hilly terrain. The Tijuana River Valley comprises most of the SYCP Area west of I-5. The topography transitions to steeper slopes immediately east of the Project Study Area.

The total area of the Project Study Area, which comprises the anticipated maximum extent of disturbance, including improvements, staging areas, and temporary impacts resulting from Project construction, encompasses approximately 50 acres. The central portion of the Project Study Area is currently occupied with transportation uses (i.e., roadways and freeways) and border facilities. Much of the remaining land, along the western and eastern sides of this central corridor, is occupied by a number of commercial establishments serving employees of the LPOE and the border-crossing population. Near the eastern edge of the Project Study Area is the terminus of the blue line trolley, which is located adjacent to the San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center. Just to the east of the transportation center is a small commercial strip, which includes a privately owned and operated long-haul bus depot, several retail shops, a market, and several fast food restaurants. At the northernmost end of this strip is a small paid parking lot. Across I-5 and along Camiones Way are a duty-free shop and a larger paid parking lot.

Land uses surrounding the Project Study Area are largely transportation-related (I-5, I-805, the freight rail line, the blue line trolley, and other transit facilities) and commercial. The central and western areas immediately surrounding the LPOE tend to be oriented toward those traveling to and from Mexico. The Plaza de Las Americas shopping center is a regional destination and occupies a large expanse of commercial land east of the LPOE along Camino de la Plaza. In the central commercial area that extends northward from the border between the I-5/I-805 interchange and the rail line is a more diverse assemblage of commercial spaces. Businesses in this area include paid parking lots, restaurants, motels, and Mexican insurance and currency exchange establishments. North of the I-5/I-805 interchange, along West San Ysidro Boulevard, is a mix of commercial, residential, and civic (i.e. schools and parks) land uses.

## **S.2 PURPOSE AND NEED**

### **Purpose of the Project**

The purpose of the Project is to improve operational efficiency, security, and safety for cross-border travelers and federal agencies at the San Ysidro LPOE.

Project goals include:

- 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).

### **Need for the Project**

#### **Capacity and Transportation Demand**

The San Diego and Tijuana region is the largest urban border area along the entire U.S.-Mexico border, with a combined population of over four million people. The combined population of this area is anticipated to grow to over 5.5 million by 2020 (San Diego Association of Governments [SANDAG]/Caltrans 2006).

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. A fourth LPOE, Otay Mesa East, is currently in the early planning stages. Together, these LPOEs are intended to serve as the gateway for all pedestrian traffic and vehicular movement of people and goods between the San Diego region and Baja California, Mexico.

The San Ysidro LPOE is the busiest land port in North America. It is open 24 hours per day, seven days per week, and handles passenger vehicle, pedestrian, bus, and limited use rail traffic (commercial traffic in the region is currently restricted to the Otay Mesa and Tecate LPOEs). The San Ysidro LPOE currently processes approximately 50,000 northbound vehicles and 26,000 northbound pedestrians per day (SANDAG 2007). 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 during peak times. Recent studies have estimated that existing wait times for vehicles at the San Ysidro LPOE average 1.5 to 2 hours during the commuter peak period (weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m.; KOA Corporation 2009). Queues of passenger vehicles during the same commuter peak period have been estimated to number approximately 2,900 vehicles (KOA Corporation 2009).

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 border delays are expected to increase correspondingly, placing a strain on existing border facilities and infrastructure at the San Ysidro

LPOE. It is estimated that maximum wait times would exceed three hours during the commuter peak period by the year 2014, and 10 hours by the year 2030 (KOA Corporation 2009). Pedestrian and passenger vehicle border crossings between the U.S. and Mexico have risen dramatically in the past decade, reaching over 60 million people in 2006 in the San Diego County/Baja California border area alone (SANDAG/Caltrans 2006). At the San Ysidro LPOE, it is anticipated that the total number of primary inspections will increase by approximately 28 percent by 2025 (Caltrans/GSA 2007). This increase in cross-border travel, in combination with recent increases in U.S. security requirements has resulted in facility and infrastructure-related challenges. The existing facilities and infrastructure were not designed to handle the current and projected traffic volumes processed at the San Ysidro LPOE.

In addition, over 750 U.S. Government employees work at the San Ysidro LPOE. Existing on-site parking is not adequate to meet around-the-clock employee parking demands. Large areas of the secondary inspection area have been converted to employee parking. Additional employee parking spaces are needed to improve operational efficiency and accommodate employee parking demands.

Because growth is outstripping capacity at the existing LPOE, improvements are necessary to expand capacity, improve processing efficiency, and reduce border wait times.

### **Safety and Border Security**

In addition to the need to expand the San Ysidro LPOE to improve operational efficiencies, the Project will address public and employee safety and border security concerns. The layout of the existing facility compromises public and employee safety. The overcrossing is located directly above the primary inspection area, creating a potential risk in the event of a criminal incident within the inspection area below. The overcrossing also serves as the pedestrian route from East San Ysidro Boulevard into Mexico. No inspection of the southbound pedestrian traffic occurs on this overcrossing, creating similar potential safety and security issues in the event of criminal incidents. In addition, the LPOE Administrative Building is not sufficiently remote from the inspection area.

As previously discussed, large areas originally designed for secondary inspection have been converted to expand employee parking and accommodate a vehicle impound area. Movement through the remaining, constrained secondary inspection area is confusing for the public and creates the potential for vehicular and pedestrian conflicts because there is no clear separation between vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

Furthermore, the mandated implementation of border security programs, such as WHTI, US-VISIT, and SBI, requires modernization and facility upgrades. These programs require U.S. Department of Homeland Security (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; and 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. In order 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.

In summary, reconfiguration and expansion of the San Ysidro LPOE are necessary because: (1) the existing facility is undersized and requires modernization due to mandated security programs; and (2) the current configuration is inefficient and increases the potential for safety hazards and security concerns.

### **S.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Project entails the phased reconfiguration and expansion of the existing LPOE to improve operational efficiency, security, and safety for cross-border travelers and federal agencies at the San Ysidro LPOE. Two Project build alternatives were considered by a multi-disciplinary team during the Project design process, following a scoping meeting and consultation with the community. Because the Project concerns improvements to a LPOE, alternative Project locations were not considered since the precise location of such a facility requires a formal agreement between the Governments of the U.S. and Mexico. Improvements at the existing Otay Mesa LPOE and development of a new LPOE at Otay Mesa East have been shown to be needed with or without the Project, and plans to move forward at these other LPOEs are currently in process. Consequently, all the build alternatives considered represent design/operational variations at the existing LPOE location. The alternatives described and evaluated in this Final EIS include the Preferred Alternative, the Pedestrian Crossing Alternative, and the No Build Alternative. After full consideration of the technical studies and analysis contained in this Final EIS, GSA has identified the Preferred Alternative as the build alternative that would achieve the Project purpose and need while avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts.

#### **Preferred Alternative**

The Preferred Alternative would demolish most of the existing facilities and new facilities would be constructed, including new northbound primary and secondary inspection areas, an administration building, a pedestrian building, a central plant, one pedestrian bridge, a parking structure, and other support structures. The only building considered for retention and renovation is the Old Customs House, which is currently undergoing a Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The expanded facility would consist of approximately 210,000 gross square feet (gsf) of building space, 31 northbound inspection lanes, two new southbound pedestrian crossings, and a new southbound roadway connecting with Mexico's planned El Chaparral LPOE facility. The Preferred Alternative would be constructed in three phases over a period of approximately four years, with some overlap of phases occurring. Each phase described below could function independently from subsequent phases without disrupting ongoing operations at the LPOE. Exact timing would depend upon the implementation of related facilities in Mexico.

#### **Phase 1 – Northbound Facilities**

Proposed improvements in Phase 1 would primarily entail reconfiguration of the northbound facilities to increase inspection processing capacity and operational efficiency. Construction of Phase 1 is anticipated to begin in winter 2009/2010 with an estimated duration of 18 to 24 months.

### Primary Inspection Area

The northbound primary vehicle inspection area would be reconfigured to include 24 inspection lanes, consisting of 23 standard vehicular lanes (12 feet wide) and one bus lane (14 feet wide). The standard vehicular lanes would include 46 horizontally stacked inspection booths. Stacked booths consist of two booths arranged in tandem that allow for the concurrent inspection of two cars per lane. The bus lane would include a single inspection. A portion of the primary vehicle inspection area would be covered with canopies. Vehicles cleared to enter the U.S. from the primary inspection area would be directed to northbound lanes that merge with I-5. A total of six northbound lanes (12 feet wide) would be constructed; three along the eastern portion of the LPOE, and three in the middle of the LPOE, creating a central island for secondary inspections and operations.

### Secondary Inspection Area

The existing northbound secondary inspection area would be demolished, and a new secondary inspection and operations center island would be constructed. The new secondary inspection area would contain up to 36 inspection spaces and five inspection booths and would be covered with canopies. The access points to the secondary inspection area would be equipped with non-intrusive inspection facilities, such as gamma ray scanning equipment. A new east-west connector road would be constructed to the north of the secondary inspection area that would connect to the northbound lanes merging onto I-5.

### Auto Seizure and Impound Facilities

North of the secondary inspection area, an approximately 2,700-gsf auto seizure building and impound facility would be constructed. This facility would include an impound parking lot to accommodate approximately 45 spaces for impounded vehicles, as well as two disabled spaces for employees at the auto seizures building. A portion of this area would be covered with canopies. Access would be provided from the new east-west connector road.

### Operations Center

A new operations center building would be constructed immediately east of the secondary inspection area. The operations center building would encompass approximately 50,000 gsf on two floors, and would contain a new head house and an auto breakdown facility.

### Employee Parking Structure

A multi-story employee parking structure would be constructed on the west side of southbound I-5 during Phase 1. The proposed parking structure would provide approximately 300 parking spaces on five levels (one below grade, and four above grade). A staff pedestrian bridge would also be constructed between the parking structure and the operations center. This structure would require the demolition of the former U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) building and reconfiguration of the Camiones Way turn-around. The existing Camiones Way turn-around would be relocated slightly to the north and would terminate just west of I-5. Access to the parking structure would be provided from the reconfigured Camiones Way turn-around.

## Pedestrian Facilities

Phase 1 would include construction of an east – west pedestrian bridge over the I-5 and LPOE, between the San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center and Camino de la Plaza. The proposed pedestrian bridge would connect to Camino de la Plaza from a bridge landing that would include a pedestrian ramp to the reconfigured Camiones Way turn-around. The pedestrian bridge would cross over southbound I-5, and the LPOE, and then would ramp down to the San Ysidro Intermodal Transit Center. In addition to the pedestrian ramp, a staircase also would be constructed at the eastern end of the bridge, connecting to the San Ysidro Intermodal Transit Center. A pedestrian walkway would be constructed between Camiones Way and the border to channel pedestrians around the new employee parking structure and into Mexico. The current design of the pedestrian facilities includes one canopy structure at the east end, with additional shaded areas being considered. GSA will also be locating and designing portions of these facilities to include shading and rest areas (i.e., trees and benches) for pedestrian traffic. While public restrooms are not included in the design of these pedestrian facilities, public restrooms will be provided in appropriate locations within the LPOE. The connection of the east-west pedestrian bridge to Camino de la Plaza could, in the future, be expanded as an elevated pedestrian plaza to be constructed by others as part of a separate project. An existing staff pedestrian bridge that spans the East San Ysidro Boulevard freeway ramps and connects an employee parking lot with a walkway to the existing Pedestrian Inspection Building would be demolished. The existing elevated Administration Building would remain in place and operational during Phase 1, but public access to the existing pedestrian bridge along the existing Administration Building would be closed once the new east-west pedestrian bridge is constructed.

## Southbound Pedestrian Crossing

A new southbound pedestrian crossing would be provided in the eastern portion of the LPOE near the Old Customs House. It is anticipated that this new pedestrian crossing could require modifications to the Old Customs House. Per Section 106 of the NHPA, GSA is currently in consultation with the SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties regarding the potential future use of the Old Customs House. GSA is currently working with its Mexican counterpart to determine the time frame for implementation of the proposed southbound pedestrian crossing on the east side of the LPOE. This southbound crossing is proposed to occur in Phase 1, although the exact timing would depend on implementation of related facilities in Mexico.

## Central Plant

Phase 1 would include construction of a new central plant on the eastern side of the LPOE. Two existing buildings along Rail Court (currently occupied by a Payless Shoe Store and a privately owned and operated long-haul bus station) would be demolished, and a two-story central plant encompassing approximately 24,000 gsf would be constructed to house electrical and mechanical equipment. An employee surface parking lot with approximately 35 spaces would be constructed on the east side of the central plant.

## Other Features

Other proposed features during Phase 1 would include construction of a detainee holding facility at the LPOE, and a telecommunications tower in the vicinity of the employee parking structure.

## **Phase 2 – Northbound Buildings**

Phase 2 improvements would involve the reconfiguration of the eastern operational area and construction of new buildings. Construction of Phase 2 is anticipated to begin in 2011 with an estimated duration of 24 to 30 months.

The existing Pedestrian Building would be demolished, and a new Administration and Pedestrian Building would be constructed east of the reconfigured northbound inspection facilities. The proposed Administration and Pedestrian Building would encompass approximately 100,000 gsf on three levels, and an approximately 20,000-gsf underground central detention facility. A new north–south pedestrian ramp would be constructed to channel northbound pedestrians and bicyclists from Mexico to the inspection processing facilities on the second level of this structure. During construction of the Administration and Pedestrian Building, pedestrian processing operations would temporarily be transferred to the Old Customs House. The Old Customs House would be renovated to accommodate these interim uses, and a new pedestrian sidewalk would be constructed between the border crossing and the renovated building. Following construction of the proposed improvements, the existing Administration Building and bridge (supporting the Administration Building) would be demolished.

## **Phase 3 – Southbound Facilities**

Proposed Phase 3 improvements primarily would entail the reconfiguration of the southbound facilities to connect with Mexico's planned El Chaparral facility. The reconfiguration of the southbound facilities would require removal of existing structures and Camiones Way. The existing commercial retail building (UETA Duty Free Shop) and large surface parking lots between Virginia Avenue and I-5 would be demolished. Construction of the proposed southbound roadway also would remove Camiones Way. Construction of Phase 3 is estimated to begin as early as 2011, or as late as 2013, depending on the schedule provided by Mexico for their construction of the El Chaparral facility, and would last approximately 20 to 24 months.

### Southbound Roadway

A new southbound roadway would be constructed at the terminus of southbound I-5, just south of the Camino de la Plaza overcrossing, and would curve southwestward within the LPOE to connect with the planned El Chaparral LPOE in Mexico. The roadway would consist of six southbound lanes (each 12 feet wide) plus an additional 14-foot-wide lane for employee/bus traffic into the LPOE for the first 1,000 feet. Beyond this point, the roadway would widen to 14 lanes (each 12 feet wide), and then would divide into two sets of seven lanes each just prior to the international border. This configuration of the roadway terminus would be compatible with the design of the planned El Chaparral LPOE in Mexico. A last-chance turn-around lane would be provided on the east side of the southbound roadway to allow vehicles to make a direct U-turn from the southbound roadway to northbound I-5. Additionally, the westernmost southbound lane would include a gated emergency access road to Camino de la Plaza.

### Northbound Secondary Inspection Overflow Area/Future Southbound Secondary Inspection Area

A secondary inspection area would be constructed northeast of the employee parking structure, and would include up to 17 inspection spaces and up to nine inspection booths covered with canopies. This secondary inspection area would serve as an overflow area for the northbound

secondary inspection process, but could be utilized in the future for southbound secondary inspections. The access points to the secondary inspection area would be equipped with non-intrusive inspection facilities, such as gamma ray scanning equipment. The secondary inspection area also would include an auto inspection/breakdown building. This building would encompass approximately 9,000 gsf on two floors.

The east-west connector road (constructed during Phase 1) would be extended to the west to connect the east and west portions of the LPOE and provide access to the additional secondary vehicle inspection area, employee parking, the USBP facility, and the southbound roadway.

### Pedestrian Facilities

A new southbound pedestrian crossing facility would be constructed in the western portion of the LPOE at Virginia Avenue during Phase 3. The new facility would include a new crossing and a southbound pedestrian building. The pedestrian crossing would connect to Mexico's planned El Chaparral LPOE. Once the new pedestrian crossing is constructed and operational, the existing southbound pedestrian crossing would be removed. In addition, a pedestrian ramp would be constructed between the east-west pedestrian bridge (to be completed during Phase 1), and a proposed sidewalk that would connect with Virginia Avenue to the east.

### Transit Facility

As described above, the new southbound roadway would remove Camiones Way, which includes a bus turn-around at its terminus. A new turn-around and loading facility would be constructed in the western portion of the LPOE along Virginia Avenue to accommodate buses, taxis, jitneys, and privately owned vehicles.

### USBP Facility

A new USBP station would be constructed in the southern portion of the LPOE, between the new southbound roadway and the U.S.-Mexico border. The station would consist of an approximately 3,500-gsf building, a small parking area for USBP employees, and a repatriation gate. Vehicular access to the new USBP station would be provided from the internal east-west connector road.

### Employee Parking Area

An employee parking area would be constructed in the southern portion of the LPOE between the new southbound roadway, the employee parking structure, the U.S.-Mexico border, and the USBP facility. This area would provide approximately 300 surface parking spaces, and possibly storm water retention facilities.

### Northbound Primary Inspection Area Expansion

During Phase 3, the northbound primary inspection area would be expanded by seven lanes on the west side with 14 stacked inspection booths, resulting in a total of 31 new lanes (24 lanes would be constructed in Phase 1).

Table S-1 summarizes the major proposed capacity changes under the Preferred Alternative by phase. Note that exact timing would depend upon the implementation of related facilities in Mexico.

<b>Table S-1 Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase Preferred Alternative</b>				
	Existing facility	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
<b>Northbound</b>				
Primary Inspection lanes:				
-Vehicular lanes	23	23	23	30
-Bus lanes	1	1	1	1
-Total lanes	24	24	24	31
Primary Inspection Booths	24	47	47	61
Secondary Inspection Lanes	0	6	6	6
Secondary Inspection Spaces	27	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths. Overflow area would add 17 spaces plus 9 booths.
Pedestrian Crossings	One on eastern side	One on eastern side. Expanded facilities.	One on eastern side. Expanded facilities.	One on eastern side. Expanded facilities.
<b>Southbound</b>				
Vehicle Lanes	6	6	6	14
Pedestrian Crossings	One (in central area)	Two (one each on western and eastern sides)	Two (one each on western and eastern sides)	Two (one each on western and eastern sides)

Shading indicates the onset of a capacity change.

### **Pedestrian Crossing Alternative**

The Pedestrian Crossing Alternative is similar to the Preferred Alternative, but would entail a different cross-border pedestrian circulation scheme. While the Preferred Alternative proposes to remove the existing southbound pedestrian crossing and construct two new southbound pedestrian crossings (one at Virginia Avenue and one east of the Old Customs House), the Pedestrian Crossing Alternative would provide a single southbound pedestrian crossing at its existing location.

The Pedestrian Crossing Alternative would demolish most of the existing LPOE facilities, except for the existing southbound pedestrian crossing facility and the Old Customs House. New facilities to be constructed, including new northbound primary and secondary inspection areas, an administration building, a pedestrian building, a central plant, pedestrian bridges, a parking structure and other support structures, would generally be the same as the Preferred Alternative, with some variations in configuration and location within the LPOE. This alternative would be constructed in three phases that would correspond to those of the Preferred Alternative (i.e., Phase 1 would construct the northbound facilities, Phase 2 would construct northbound buildings, and Phase 3 would construct the southbound facilities). Construction of

this alternative would occur over a period of approximately four years within the same estimated time frames as the Preferred Alternative identified above. Construction phases would overlap, but each phase could function independently from successive phases.

### **Phase 1 – Northbound Facilities**

Proposed improvements in Phase 1 would entail construction of new northbound facilities similar to those described above for the Preferred Alternative. Figure 2-4 shows the proposed improvements during Phase 1. The proposed new northbound primary and secondary inspection areas, operations center, employee parking structure, and reconfiguration of the Camiones Way turn-around would be the same as proposed under the Preferred Alternative. The auto seizure and impound facilities and central plant would be constructed at the same location as the Preferred Alternative, but the configuration would be slightly different.

The east-west pedestrian bridge would be constructed over I-5 and the LPOE, but instead of landing at the San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center, it would land on the north side of the East San Ysidro Boulevard/I-5 freeway ramp. The west end of the pedestrian bridge would connect to an elevated bridge deck extending from Camino de la Plaza. This deck would be larger than the bridge landing proposed under the Preferred Alternative.

### **Phase 2 – Northbound Buildings**

Proposed improvements during Phase 2 under the Pedestrian Crossing Alternative would be the same as the Preferred Alternative identified above. Figure 2-5 illustrates proposed improvements during Phase 2.

### **Phase 3 – Southbound Facilities**

Proposed Phase 3 improvements would primarily consist of the construction of new southbound facilities similar to those described above for the Preferred Alternative. Figure 2-6 depicts proposed improvements during Phase 3.

The proposed northbound secondary inspection overflow area/future southbound secondary inspection area, the pedestrian ramp connecting to the east-west pedestrian bridge (constructed in Phase 1), the removal of Camiones Way, and the northbound primary inspection area expansion would be the same as proposed under the Preferred Alternative. The southbound roadway would be the same as proposed under the Preferred Alternative except that an exit lane to Virginia Avenue would be provided from the westernmost southbound lane.

A new north-south pedestrian bridge would be built over the proposed southbound roadway, connecting the proposed elevated bridge deck and main east-west pedestrian bridge (to be completed during Phase 1) to the pedestrian walkway at the existing southbound pedestrian crossing facility.

The USBP station would be constructed in the southern portion of the LPOE, just west of the employee parking structure and north-south pedestrian bridge.

This alternative would not construct the bus-turn around facility in the western portion of the LPOE along Virginia Avenue proposed under the Preferred Alternative, but would provide a smaller turn-around at the south leg of the Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps intersection.

Table S-2 summarizes the major proposed capacity changes under the Pedestrian Crossing Alternative by phase. Note that exact timing would depend upon the implementation of related facilities in Mexico.

<b>Table S-2 Summary of Major Proposed Capacity Changes by Phase Pedestrian Crossing Alternative</b>				
	Existing facility	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
<b>Northbound</b>				
Primary Inspection Lanes:				
-Vehicular lanes	23	23	23	30
-Bus lanes	1	1	1	1
-Total lanes	24	24	24	31
Primary Inspection Booths	24	47	47	61
Secondary Inspection Lanes	0	6	6	6
Secondary Inspection Spaces	27 spaces	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths	Up to 36 spaces plus 5 inspection booths. Overflow area would add 17 spaces plus 9 booths.
Pedestrian Crossings	One on eastern side	One on eastern side	One on eastern side	One on eastern side
<b>Southbound</b>				
Vehicle Lanes	6	6	6	14
Pedestrian Crossings	One (in central area)	One (in central area)	One (in central area)	One (in central area)

Shading indicates the onset of a capacity change.

### **No Build Alternative**

The No Build Alternative is included and analyzed to provide a baseline for comparison with impacts from the Project, and also to satisfy federal requirements for analyzing “no action” under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1502.14(d)). This alternative assumes that no improvements to the existing San Ysidro LPOE would be implemented. The No Build Alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the Project, as operational constraints and safety/security deficiencies would not be corrected, and the wait times to cross the border would be expected to increase.

### **S.4 PROJECT IMPACTS**

Table S-1 summarizes Project impacts and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for each alternative. Detailed discussion and analysis of Project impacts are provided in Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIS. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are listed in Appendix A, Summary of Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures.

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Land Use</b>			
<i>Existing and Future Land Uses</i>			
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 underlying zoning and land use designations.	No impacts to existing or planned land uses would occur.	<u>Preferred Alternative, Pedestrian Crossing Alternative, and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
<i>Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans</i>			
Consistent with relevant land use plans.	Potentially inconsistent with certain policies in SANDAG's RCP, the City's General Plan Mobility and Economic Prosperity Elements, the SYCP and the SYRP.	Would not comply with SANDAG's RCP, RTP, and RTIP, and would not be consistent with the General Plan, SYCP, and SYRP.	<u>Preferred Alternative and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required. <u>Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Impacts could only be avoided through Project redesign.
<i>Parks and Recreational Facilities</i>			
No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	No impacts to public parks or recreational facilities.	<u>Preferred Alternative, Pedestrian Crossing Alternative, and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
<b>Community</b>			
<i>Community Character and Cohesion</i>			
No impacts to community character or cohesion would occur.	Potential adverse impacts to community cohesion due to inefficiencies in pedestrian circulation plan and access to transit facilities.	No impacts to community character or cohesion, but would result in further degradation of traffic, circulation, and access for the community and the region.	<u>Preferred Alternative:</u> Although no avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be implemented during construction to maintain through traffic and access to businesses. <u>Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> A TMP would be implemented during construction. Adverse impacts could only be avoided through Project redesign. <u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
<i>Relocations</i>			
No substantial impacts related to relocation of three on-site businesses, because property acquisitions in progress are following guidelines of the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.	No substantial impacts related to relocation of three on-site businesses, because property acquisitions in progress are following guidelines of the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.	Property acquisitions in progress would occur and would follow the guidelines of the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.	<u>Preferred Alternative, Pedestrian Crossing Alternative, and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.

**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
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Community (cont.)</b>			
<i>Environmental Justice and Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children</i>			
Because of the public outreach efforts, the design changes in response to community concerns, and implementation of other avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Final EIS, no adverse environmental justice impacts would be anticipated. No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	Because of the public outreach efforts, the design changes in response to community concerns, and implementation of other avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures discussed throughout this Final EIS, no adverse environmental justice impacts would be anticipated. No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	Adverse environmental justice impacts due to increasing congestion, and no economic benefits and improved access associated with the Project. No impacts related to environmental health and safety risks to children.	<u>Preferred Alternative, Pedestrian Crossing Alternative, and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are required.
<b>Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety</b>			
<i>Utilities</i>			
Temporary construction-related utilities impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related utilities impacts could potentially occur during construction.	No impacts to utilities would occur.	<u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.
<i>Emergency Services</i>			
Temporary construction-related impacts to emergency services could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related impacts to emergency services could potentially occur during construction.	No impacts to emergency services would occur.	<u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) should be implemented to provide for emergency access on roadways that would be temporarily affected during the construction period.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety (cont.)</b>			
<i>Life Safety</i>			
No impacts to life safety with implementation of protective design measures.	No life safety impacts resulting from operations within the LPOE with implementation of protective design measures. Adverse life safety impacts due to pedestrian circulation plan.	No impacts to life safety would occur, but existing life safety deficiencies at the LPOE would not be corrected.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Exterior windows and interior windows between high-risk areas and occupied space should be thermally tempered or laminated glass.</li> <li>▪ Bullet resistant glazing should be provided on windows that face inspection areas, on-coming traffic, or the border.</li> <li>▪ Building perimeters and doors between inspection areas should be designed to resist forced entry.</li> <li>▪ Utilities critical to LPOE operations should be located within the Central Plant building, which would be structurally reinforced.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Air intakes should be secured.</li> <li>▪ Mechanical equipment should not be placed at grade and directly adjacent to vehicle movement pathways.</li> <li>▪ Utilities and feeders should not be located adjacent to vehicle pathways, or on the Mexican side of the primary inspection lanes.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Utilities/Emergency Services/Life Safety (cont.)</b>			
			<p><u>Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Implementation of the protective design measures identified for the Preferred Alternative would avoid life safety impacts associated with operations within the LPOE. Adverse life safety impacts related pedestrian circulation could only be avoided through Project redesign.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</b>			
<i>Roadways, Freeways, and Intersections</i>			
<p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound ramps and Calle Primera</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Via de San Ysidro/Calle Primera</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro/I-5 northbound ramps</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p>	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>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 Preferred Alternative or Pedestrian Crossing 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 Project does not include local roadway improvements; however, the EIS considers all traffic impacts and identifies measures that would help avoid, minimize or mitigate such impacts, as outlined below. NEPA requires the decision-maker to consider the impacts of the proposed action, but does not require the agency to adopt such measures. GSA will consider adopting and implementing measures that are determined to be feasible and consistent with existing laws, regulations and authorities applicable to GSA, particularly with regard to the availability of, and authority to expend, funds. Authorized funds may not be available to implement all of the proposed mitigation measures. Any mitigation measures adopted by the agency will be identified in the Project Record of Decision.</p> <p>Implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures would avoid or reduce traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections for near-term (2014) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps, to four-lane major standards.</li> <li>Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
<b>Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (cont.)</b>			
<p>Traffic impacts to freeway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northbound I-5, between the international border and the I-805 interchange</li> <li>Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to freeway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northbound I-5, between the international border and the I-805 interchange</li> <li>Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Via de San Ysidro/Calle Primera</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro/I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul>	<p>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 horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Adverse traffic impacts to three freeway segments under horizon year conditions would occur. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are identified to lessen these impacts; however, the benefits of greatly reducing congestion (wait times and vehicle queues) for northbound vehicles crossing the border would offset these impacts.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities</b>			
No impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.	Adverse impacts related to inefficient pedestrian circulation plan and access to transit facilities.	No impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><u>Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Impacts could only be avoided through Project redesign.</p>
<b>Temporary Construction Impacts</b>			
Temporary construction-related traffic impacts could potentially occur during construction.	Temporary construction-related traffic impacts could potentially occur during construction.	No construction-related traffic impacts would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Temporary impacts would be avoided with implementation of a TMP.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Visual/Aesthetics</b>			
No adverse visual impacts would occur.	No adverse visual impacts would occur.	No adverse visual impacts would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Although no adverse visual impacts would occur, implementation of the following minimization measures would provide increased visual quality within the Project Study Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A comprehensive landscape concept plan should be developed and implemented, including landscape features such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Drought tolerant and sustainable plant palettes.</li> <li>○ Vine planting at fences and walls to reduce the visual scale and to act as a graffiti deterrent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Street trees and landscaping should be retained to the highest extent possible during Project construction.</li> <li>▪ Architectural treatments should be consistent throughout the proposed LPOE buildings.</li> <li>▪ Metal fencing and safety railing should be consistent throughout the proposed pedestrian walkways.</li> <li>▪ Where possible, integrate new public art consistent with the international border setting.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
<i>Archaeological Resources</i>			
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 construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no impacts to archaeological resources would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<i>Historical Resources</i>			
Interim renovation and ultimate future use of the NRHP-listed Old Customs House would result in an adverse direct impact to this historical property.	Interim renovation use of the NRHP-listed Old Customs House would result in an adverse direct impact to this historical property.	No impacts to historical resources would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>The following measures would avoid, minimize, or mitigate direct impacts to historical resources during renovation of the Old Customs House:</p>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Cultural Resources (cont.)</b>			
Construction of the Preferred Alternative's Central Plant building would indirectly impact the abutting International Building, which is recommended eligible to the NRHP, CRHP, and City Register.	Construction of the Preferred Alternative's Central Plant building would indirectly impact the abutting International Building, which is recommended eligible to the NRHP, CRHP, and City Register.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All renovation of the Old Customs House for interim pedestrian processing operations and any future use should conform to <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p>If all adverse effects cannot be avoided, then other mitigation measures will be determined through Section 106 consultation.</p> <p>The following measure would avoid, minimize, or mitigate indirect impacts to historical resources, including the International Building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Measures consistent with <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> would be implemented as agreed to in the Section 106 consultation process.</li> </ul> <p>If all adverse effects cannot be avoided, then other mitigation measures will be determined through Section 106 consultation.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Hydrology and Floodplain</b>			
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 construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no hydrology or floodplain impacts would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff</b>			
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 construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no water quality or stormwater runoff impacts would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>Water quality and storm water 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).</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography</b>			
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, International Building Code (IBC), and California Building Code (CBC), and incorporation of geotechnical recommendations.	No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to geology, soils, seismicity or topography.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Paleontology</b>			
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.	No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no impacts to paleontological resources would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Paleontology (cont.)</b>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos and maps, should be deposited in an approved scientific institution with paleontological collections.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Hazardous Waste/Materials</b>			
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 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 Project Study Area and LPOE. Additionally, potential adverse impacts could occur associated with ADL, hazardous building materials, and PCBs.	No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to hazardous waste or hazardous materials.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Soil sampling should be conducted in areas within the Project Study Area 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.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Hazardous Waste/Materials (cont.)</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Health risk assessments should be conducted for facilities within the LPOE in which contamination has been documented (e.g., former Red Cab facility) to evaluate whether the levels of contaminants would pose a risk to human health.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Existing transformers and elevator equipment within the Project Study Area 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.</li> <li>▪ Wastes and potentially hazardous waste on the Project site, including trash, debris piles, and equipment should be removed and disposed of off site in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Hazardous Waste/Materials (cont.)</b>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Contract specifications should include references to the potential to encounter contaminated soil, groundwater, or other regulated wastes during construction activities.</li> </ul> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Air Quality</b>			
No adverse construction or operational air quality impacts would occur. No adverse air quality impacts related to Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs) or global climate change would occur.	No adverse construction or operational air quality impacts would occur. No adverse air quality impacts related to MSATs or global climate change would occur.	No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no air quality impacts would occur.	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u> Although no adverse air quality impacts would occur, implementation of the following minimization measures would minimize air pollution emissions during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water or dust palliative should be applied to exposed soil surfaces at the construction site(s) and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.</li> <li>▪ Soil binder should be spread on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all construction parking areas.</li> <li>▪ Trucks should be washed off as they leave the construction site(s), as necessary, to control fugitive dust emissions.</li> <li>▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained. Low sulfur fuel should be used in all construction equipment.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Transported loads of soils and wet materials should be covered prior to transport, or adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) should be provided to reduce PM10 and deposition of particulate during transportation.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Air Quality (cont.)</b>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic should be removed to decrease particulate matter.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Grading and earth moving should be suspended when wind gusts exceed 25 mph unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes.</li> </ul> <p>To the extent that it is applicable or feasible, the following measures can help to reduce Project-related GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide landscaping where possible, which reduces surface warming and decreases CO<sub>2</sub> through photosynthesis</li> <li>▪ Use lighter color surfaces, such as Portland cement, which helps to reduce the albedo effect (i.e., surface reflectivity of the sun's radiation) and cool the surface</li> <li>▪ Use of energy efficient lighting</li> <li>▪ Limit idling times on trucks and equipment used during construction</li> </ul> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Energy</b>			
<p>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 Project achieving a LEED certification for the LPOE, as is currently planned, as well as compliance with the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p>	<p>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 Project achieving a LEED certification for the LPOE, as is currently planned, as well as compliance with the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p>	<p>No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no short-term, construction-related energy impacts would occur. Over the long-term, however, the No Build Alternative would contribute to continued long delays to cross the border, with associated traffic congestion and inefficient energy use by idling vehicles, which would be expected to increase over time.</p> <p>In addition, the existing LPOE facilities would not be replaced with facilities that are designed to be more energy efficient.</p>	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained.</li> <li>▪ Idling times of construction equipment should be minimized, to the extent practical.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Biological Resources</b>			
<p>Would impact a total of 0.1 acre of disturbed habitat, 25.7 acres of developed land, and 0.07 acre of non-wetland Waters of the United States (WUS). Phase 1 would result in impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed habitat and 11.3 acres of developed land; Phase 2 would result in impacts to 2.6 acres of developed land; and Phase 3 would result in impacts to 0.01 acre of disturbed habitat, 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS, and 11.8 acres of developed land.</p> <p>No sensitive vegetation communities, or sensitive or federally threatened or endangered plant or animal species would be impacted and therefore, no associated adverse impacts would occur.</p>	<p>Would impact a total of 0.2 acre of disturbed habitat, 22.1 acres of developed land, and 0.05 acre of non-wetland WUS. Phase 1 would result in impacts to 0.1 acre of disturbed habitat and 11.9 acres of developed land; Phase 2 would result in impacts to 2.9 acres of developed land; and Phase 3 would result in impacts to 0.07 acre of disturbed habitat, 0.05 acre of non-wetland WUS, and 7.3 acres of developed land.</p> <p>No sensitive vegetation communities, or sensitive or federally threatened or endangered plant or animal species would be impacted and therefore, no associated adverse impacts would occur.</p>	<p>No construction or ground disturbing activities would occur; therefore, no impacts to biological resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During 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.</li> <li>▪ Impacts to 0.07 acre of non-wetland WUS under the Preferred Alternative or 0.05 acre of non-wetland WUS under the Pedestrian Crossing Alternative should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through purchase of mitigation credits equal to 0.07 acre (Preferred Alternative) or 0.05 acre (Pedestrian Crossing Alternative) of ephemeral drainage at an approved mitigation bank.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
<b>Biological Resources (cont.)</b>			
Potential for indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality.	Potential for indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p>Potential indirect impacts to biological resources due to decreased water quality would be addressed through the measures identified above under Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff.</p> <p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>			
<i>Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</i>			
<p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>• East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>• Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>• Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to freeway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p>	<p>Traffic impacts to roadway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>• East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>• Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> <li>• Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> </ul>	<p>Under the No Build Alternative, traffic volumes on traffic study area roadway segments and intersections would increase as the community is built out. Cumulative traffic impacts would occur to the following roadway segments and intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue to the I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>▪ East San Ysidro Boulevard, between the I-805 northbound ramps and Border Village Road</li> <li>▪ Via de San Ysidro, between East San Ysidro Boulevard and the I-5 northbound ramps</li> </ul>	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>Implementation (by others) of the following measures would avoid or reduce cumulative traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Widening of the segment of Camino de la Plaza, between Virginia Avenue and the I-5 southbound ramps to four-lane major standards.</li> <li>▪ Installation of a traffic signal at the Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue intersection.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p>Adverse traffic impacts to three freeway segments under horizon year conditions would occur. No avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures are identified to lessen these impacts; however, the benefits of greatly reducing congestion (wait times and vehicle queues) for northbound vehicles crossing the border would offset these impacts.</p>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
<b>Cumulative Impacts (cont.)</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northbound I-5, between the international border and the I-805 interchange</li> <li>Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic impacts to freeway segments under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northbound I-5, between the international border and the I-805 interchange</li> <li>Northbound I-805, between the I-5 interchange and East San Ysidro Boulevard</li> </ul> <p>Traffic impacts to intersections under horizon year (2030) conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps</li> <li>Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Via de San Ysidro, between the I-5 southbound off-ramp and Calle Primera</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro/Calle Primera (LOS F during PM peak period)</li> <li>Via de San Ysidro/I-5 northbound ramps (LOS F during PM peak period)</li> <li>Camino de la Plaza/I-5 southbound ramps (LOS E during PM peak period)</li> <li>Camino de la Plaza/Virginia Avenue (LOS F during PM peak period)</li> </ul> <p>Wait times for northbound traffic at the LPOE are forecast to exceed 10 hours if no improvements are made to the existing LPOE. This would result in extremely long queues of vehicles waiting to cross the border.</p>	<p><u>No Build Alternative:</u> As no action would occur, no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.</p>
<i>Air Quality</i>			
<p>No adverse cumulative operational or global climate change impacts would occur. Potential adverse cumulative construction impacts could occur if multiple projects within the SYCP Area are under construction at the same time.</p>	<p>No adverse cumulative operational or global climate change impacts would occur. Potential adverse cumulative construction impacts could occur if multiple projects within the SYCP Area are under construction at the same time.</p>	<p>No adverse cumulative air quality impacts would occur, but existing traffic congestion would not be reduced, so associated emissions would remain high.</p>	<p><u>Preferred Alternative and Pedestrian Crossing Alternative:</u></p> <p>Implementation of the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures would reduce cumulative air quality impacts resulting from construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water or dust palliative should be applied to exposed soil surfaces at the construction site(s) and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions.</li> <li>Soil binder should be spread on any unpaved roads used for construction purposes, and all construction parking areas.</li> </ul>

**Table S-3  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES**

Potential Impacts of the Project			Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
Preferred Alternative	Pedestrian Crossing Alternative	No Build Alternative	
<b>Cumulative Impacts (cont.)</b>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Trucks should be washed off as they leave the construction site(s), as necessary, to control fugitive dust emissions.</li> <li>▪ Construction equipment and vehicles should be properly tuned and maintained. <sup>Low.</sup> sulfur fuel should be used in all construction equipment.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transported loads of soils and wet materials should be covered prior to transport, or adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck) should be provided to reduce PM<sub>10</sub> and deposition of particulate during transportation.</li> <li>▪ Dust and mud that are deposited on paved, public roads due to construction activity and traffic should be removed to decrease particulate matter.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ Grading and earth moving should be suspended when wind gusts exceed 25 mph unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes.</li> </ul> <p><u>Global Climate Change:</u> To the extent that it is applicable or feasible, the following measures can help to reduce GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide landscaping where possible, which reduces surface warming and decreases CO<sub>2</sub> through photosynthesis</li> <li>▪ Use lighter color surfaces, such as Portland cement, which helps to reduce the albedo effect (i.e., surface reflectivity of the sun's radiation) and cool the surface</li> <li>▪ Use of energy efficient lighting</li> <li>▪ Limit idling times on trucks and equipment used during construction</li> </ul>

## S.5 COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AND OTHER AGENCIES

### Permits and Approvals Needed

The following permits and approvals would be required for the Project:

Permit or Approval	Agency	Purpose
Presidential Permit	U.S. Department of State	Approve new points of crossing, certain construction activities and otherwise comply with EO 13337 (April 30, 2004).
Clean Water Act Section 404 Nationwide Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)	Impacts to waters of the U.S.
Section 401 Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	Impacts to waters of the U.S.
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	State Water Resources Control Board	General Construction Activity Permit
General Groundwater Extraction Waste Discharge Permit	RWCQB	General Construction Activity Permit
Permits to Operate emergency generators	San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD)	Air quality impacts
Section 106 consultation	SHPO, pursuant to the NHPA	Old Customs House
GSA Public Buildings Service Commissioner approval of project design	GSA	Design approval
Temporary Construction Easement	Caltrans	For work within Caltrans' ROW on Camino de la Plaza (if needed)

### Consultation and Coordination with Public Agencies

GSA consulted with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on biological resource issues. USFWS Carlsbad Field Office was contacted in February 2009 via U.S. mail to request USFWS's assessment for potential presence of federally listed threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing species. A written response has not yet been received; however, USFWS discussed listed threatened, endangered, and proposed for listing species that may occur in the Project vicinity in a telephone conversation between USFWS staff and the environmental contractor on February 3, 2009.

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 the Project area. Consultation with local Native American tribes was recommended, and a list of Native American contacts was provided. Letters describing the Project and a map of the study area were mailed to local Native American representatives provided by NAHC in January and March 2009. Letters dated January 6, 2009 were mailed to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians, Cuyapaipe Band of Mission Indians, Jamul Band of Mission Indians, La Posta Band of Mission Indians, Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Mission Indians, Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, Santa Ysabel Band of Mission Indians, Sycuan Band of Mission Indians, and Viejas Band of Mission Indians.

Per Section 106 of the NHPA, GSA is currently in consultation with the SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties regarding the potential future use of the Old Customs House.

Ongoing coordination between GSA and DHS and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has occurred regarding the design of Project. Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), SANDAG, and the City have also been consulted in regards to the Project and its interface with transportation and community facilities. Additionally, GSA is coordinating with the U.S. Department of State about obtaining a Presidential Permit.

## **Public Participation**

A Notice of Intent (NOI) was prepared for the Project and published in the Federal Register on July 2, 2003. A public scoping meeting was held in the community on July 23, 2003 from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the San Ysidro Multi-cultural Center, located at 4345 Otay Mesa Road, to give the community an opportunity to review and comment on the Project. The notice for the scoping meeting was published in the Federal Register as part of the NOI.

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 has been regularly hosting CRC meetings, as needed, to facilitate coordination and maintain an open dialogue between GSA and the community regarding the Project.

The Draft EIS was made available to the public on May 8, 2009. A public hearing took place on June 10, 2009 to discuss the Draft EIS. The public review period closed on June 22. The Notice of Availability for the EIS and notice of public hearing were published in English in the San Diego Union Tribune on May 21, 2009 and in Spanish in the San Diego/South Bay newspaper *Hispanos Unidos* on Sunday, May 29, 2009, before the June 10 hearing. The Executive Summary, translated into Spanish, was made available on the GSA website ([www.gsa.gov/nepalibrary](http://www.gsa.gov/nepalibrary)), along with the entire EIS, the traffic study and the mobility study (in English). Copies of the translated Executive Summary were provided at the public hearing. Signs and comment cards for the public hearing were displayed and made available in both English and Spanish. Additionally, Spanish interpretation was provided at the public hearing. Attendees included local residents and representatives of local businesses, government, and community groups. Government representatives from the city, region, state and federal levels were also present. Participants were given the option of leaving comment cards or recording oral comments. No oral comments were recorded, but three comment cards were submitted during the hearing. During the public comment period, including the public hearing, a total of 21 comment cards and letters were received from public agencies, organizations, businesses and individuals. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the Draft EIS during the circulation period, copies of their comments, and GSA's responses are provided in Chapter 4.0 of this Final EIS.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK