

County of Orange
Review of Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities
Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)

AREA OF CONCERN: AIRPORT OPERATIONS	
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 60-62	<p>Information is presented on airport ground access and airport financial and marketing strategies. These strategies identify potential sources of funding such as: a) charging fees for private vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers at congested airports; b) a regional funding mechanism using revenues generated at congested airports to support facilities and development at alternate airports (requiring new legislation); and c) funding a region-wide marketing effort through sources such as airport parking and rental car transactions. Including these specific strategies in the RTP document may raise expectations that these strategies are supported by airports in the region. However, due to the competitive nature of most airports, it may be difficult to achieve such support. It may also be challenging to garner airline and FAA support.</p> <p>It is suggested that the airport strategies text be revised to recognize that any incentives or funding mechanisms that are proposed, and which affect other airports in the region, should be developed through regional consensus. Although many of the SCS “Airport Policies and Action Steps” suggest such an approach, this should be stated in the strategies text as well, and it should be clear that while these strategies may be explored, they may or may not be pursued. Additionally, SCAG should invite the FAA and airline representatives to be part of any discussions which address the concept of using revenues from one airport to benefit another.</p>
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 61	<p>A revision to the <i>Airport Ground Access Strategy</i> section (end of the first paragraph) is suggested as follows: “Potential sources of funding could include charging fees for private vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers at the congested airports. This would not adversely impact existing airport revenues and would could have a number of advantages.....”</p> <p>This revision is proposed because, with respect to the third bullet, a case could be made that although there are advantages to passengers using public transportation, it is possible that parking revenues would be adversely impacted.</p>
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 61	<p>The <i>Airport Financial Strategy</i> section should be revised to avoid making inferences that an issue “should not be controversial,” especially related to a strategy that identifies a requirement for legislative changes allowing funds from one airport to be used at another airport(s) not operated by the same entity. It should also be clarified that such legislative changes would be needed at both the state and federal levels.</p>
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments	<p>The <i>Airport Marketing Strategy</i> section suggests that SCAG work with regional stakeholders to develop region-wide marketing efforts to promote alternatives to the use of congested airports. A variety of funding sources is suggested; however, airport parking and rental car transactions are specifically mentioned. These funding sources may or may not be supported by airports in the SCAG region and should be thoroughly</p>

Page 62	discussed and, as stated in the document, a consensus of the region's airports should be developed before proceeding with such a strategy.
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 62	The <i>Airport Policies and Actions Steps</i> identify certain actions that are recommended by SCAG. The sub-section, <i>Airspace Planning and New Technologies</i> , identifies policies related to modifications to the regional airspace system, and airspace capacity and constraints. It is suggested that the wording, “in coordination with the FAA,” be added to each of the bullet points in this section.
AREA OF CONCERN: PUBLIC HEALTH	
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	
Chapter 1 – Vision Page 15, Table 1.3	Note, via additional check, connection between “Safety and Health” and “Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized transportation.”
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 53	The collection of additional data on active transportation, including greater specificity in destinations, geographic detail, and types of active transportation, is important in ensuring data driven transportation systems.
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 53	The proposed expansion of bikeways represents an exciting opportunity to facilitate active transportation, improve air quality, and reduce chronic disease risk. The connectivity of such an expanded bikeway network with transit systems, centers of employment, and residential areas, particularly those most likely to use and benefit from such assets, is also an important part of such a plan.
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 53	The improvement of sidewalk infrastructure proposed in the RTP/SCS is likely to facilitate walking as sidewalk quality can be a key factor affecting walkability.
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments Page 54	Safe Routes to School: Besides their benefits in reducing congestion related to the drop-off and pick-up of students, Safe Routes to School initiatives can facilitate important daily incidental walking and biking, which can substantially increase the chances of children meeting daily physical activity recommendations. Though the draft RTP/SCS recognizes the importance of Safe Routes to School, it could better detail how Safe Routes to School programs, assets, and principles will be integrated into the plan.
Chapter 2 – Transportation Investments	SCAG's encouragement of Complete Streets is important to the local implementation of Complete Streets policies consistent with AB1358. Augmented and explicit support in the RTP/SCS for physical and engineering changes that facilitate safe multi-modal, multi-user roadway utilization may be beneficial. Consider increasing regional coordination in Complete Street policy implementation to facilitate continuity across

Page 54	local jurisdictions.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.3	We would be excited to participate in the Action/Strategy, “Collaborate with the region’s public health professionals to enhance how SCAG addresses public health issues in its regional planning, programming, and project development activities.” The inclusion of “Local Jurisdictions” in the “Responsible Parties” field would further bolster local collaborations, including those with Public Health Departments.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.3	The Action/Strategy “Consider developing healthy community or active design guidelines that promote physical activity and improved health” has considerable promise. The inclusion of “State” in “Responsible Parties” would bolster coordination, collaboration, and support in generating guidelines.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.3	In reference to “Engage in a strategic planning process to determine the critical components and implementation steps for identifying and addressing open space resources,” please consider including increasing / preserving park space, specifically in park-poor communities.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.4	Perhaps the Action/Strategies “Encourage the implementation of a Complete Streets policy” and “Emphasize active transportation projects as part of complying with the Complete Streets Act (AB 1358)” could be tied together somehow given they will likely be implemented in concert.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.4	The Action/Strategy “Develop infrastructure plans and educational programs to promote active transportation options” may benefit from engaging local public health departments, walking/biking coalitions, and/or Safe Routes to School initiatives, who may already have components of such educational programs in place.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 150, Table 4.4	We also had some additional suggested language. The additions are underlined: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Perform and support studies with the goal of identifying innovative transportation strategies that enhance mobility and air quality, and determine practical steps to pursue such strategies. <u>Engage local communities in planning and prioritization efforts.</u> 2. Continue to work with neighboring Metropolitan Planning Organizations to provide alternative modes for interregional travel, including Amtrak and other passenger

	<p>rail services, <u>and an enhanced bikeway network, such as on river trails.</u></p> <p>3. Prioritize transportation investments to support compact infill development that includes a mix of land uses and housing options, <u>including park space</u>, where appropriate, to maximize the benefits for existing communities, especially vulnerable populations, and to minimize any negative impacts.</p>
<p>Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy</p> <p>Page 152, Table 4.5</p>	<p>We also had some additional suggested language. The additions are underlined:</p> <p>Support work-based programs that encourage emission reduction strategies <u>and incentivize active transportation commuting or ride-share modes.</u></p>
<p>Chapter 5 – Measuring Up</p> <p>Page 162, Table 5.1</p>	<p>Augment Safety and Health indicators within RTP performance measures. Consider measures of obesity, non-motorized commuting, walking and biking behavior, asthma hospitalization rates, etc.</p>
<p>AREA OF CONCERN: LAND USE POLICIES</p>	
<p>Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy</p>	
<p>Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy</p> <p>Page 110</p>	<p>The goals and benefits of the SCS listed here go above and beyond the requirements of SB 375. The provisions of SB 375 require the development of a SCS that focuses on a reduction of vehicle miles traveled by cars and light trucks, and greenhouse gas emissions. A presentation made by SCAG in January 2009 indicated that “SB 375 is not about: green buildings, energy efficiency, municipal operations, waste management, water, technology.” However, all of these items have been incorporated into the RTP/SCS and PEIR.</p>
<p>Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy</p> <p>Page 119</p>	<p>SCAG indicates that the policies of its Compass Blueprint program will be used to determine consistency of private development and public infrastructure projects with the SCS. A statement should be added that will clarify whether or not a project that is determined to be inconsistent with the policies of the SCS (i.e, Compass Blueprint) will be deemed ineligible for transportation funding.</p>
<p>Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy</p> <p>Page 148</p>	<p>Throughout the document the RTP is described as having “growth inducing impacts.” In past iterations of the RTP, its purpose was to mitigate the impacts of growth. If transportation projects identified in the RTP are seen as inducing growth, then the lead agency may be required to mitigate the impacts of perceived subsequent related growth.</p>
<p>RTP/SCS and PEIR</p>	<p>There are several terms contained throughout the RTP/SCS and PEIR that need to be clearly defined including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Growth Boundary • Parking Cash Out

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to benchmarks • SCRIIP • Gentrification • Open space • Smart growth principles • Active Transportation • Greenfield
RTP/SCS and PEIR	The alternatives discussed in the RTP/SCS, PEIR and SCS Background Document have been inconsistently named. The alternatives are labeled either: 1, 2 and 3, or A, B and C. The appropriate name should be determined for each and these documents revised to ensure consistency.
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Program Environmental Impact Report	
Introduction Page 1-5	The statement “Lead agencies shall provide SCAG with documentation of compliance with mitigation measures through SCAG’s monitoring efforts, including SCAG’s Intergovernmental Review (IGR) process,” gives the impression that these mitigation measures are mandatory and not merely a list of “menu options.” This statement should be revised to reflect that these measures are advisory only.
Project Description Page 1-5, 1-7	The strategies listed in the Project Description section are not consistent with the strategies listed in Chapter 4 of the RTP/SCS. Specifically, the bulleted list on the page is stated to represent the land use strategies of the plan, however, the strategies listed are not specifically identified in the regional SCS. Including different language in the PEIR implies additional policy.
Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	The PEIR indicates that the proposed mitigation measures have been determined to be feasible and local jurisdictions “can and should” implement them. However, SCAG staff has indicated that these measures are only advisory. Therefore, this language should be revised to reflect that it will be left to each local jurisdiction to determine the feasibility and applicability of each measure to future projects.
Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	The PEIR contains mitigation measures that appear to expand SCAG’s overall purview. Several also appear to extend into the purview of local jurisdictions. If so, this may lead to loss of local control over land use policies and/or operations.
Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	The PEIR contains several mitigation measures that propose new funding sources including new fees, fines, taxes, incentives, etc., that would impose a financial burden on local jurisdictions and which could result in an increase in the cost of new housing and other development. New taxes or fees could be subject to the voter approval requirements of Proposition 218 as well as Proposition 26, and SCAG has no ability to determine the feasibility of this measure.
Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	The PEIR contains 190 mitigation measures that provide very specific requirements in areas that are already regulated by local, state or federal agencies. To avoid the potential for conflicting requirements, the PEIR should only require compliance with existing regulations. Please see the attached matrix that identifies these specific mitigation measures.

Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	The PEIR contains over 50 mitigation measures that either reflect SCAG policies or propose new policies intended to be adopted by local jurisdictions or other entities. It is inappropriate to use mitigation measures to adopt policy. Please see the attached matrix that identifies these specific mitigation measures.
Executive Summary Pages ES-4 through ES-87	In several mitigation measures references are made to existing guidance documents. Guidance documents are there as information sources for consideration and do not represent regulation or establish standards that are required to be achieved. For example, MM-AQ19 inappropriately indicates that project sponsors should comply with the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (June 2005) which is only a guidance document.
AREA OF CONCERN: STORMWATER RUNOFF	
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 82-83	<p>The RTP/SCS describes the following measures contained in the “water resources mitigation program:”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Utilizing advanced water capture and filtration techniques, showing a preference for naturalized systems and designs to control stormwater at the source;” 2. “Avoiding any new construction of impervious surfaces in non-urbanized areas, such as wetlands, habitat areas, parks and near river systems;” 3. “Avoiding any new construction that provides access to flood-prone areas, such as alluvial fans and slide zones;” and 4. “Expansion of (natural flood control systems, such as wetlands and riparian buffers) in areas where they do not currently exist”. <p>It is unclear how such measures would be implemented if they are included in this document. If they are to be viewed by local jurisdictions as either goals or suggested policies, they could be implemented on that basis to the extent they were deemed feasible in any given case. On the other hand, if listing such measures indicates they are deemed reasonable and feasible to be applied by municipalities in all new road projects, that is quite another matter and not supportable.</p> <p>For example, while it may be desirable to utilize advanced water capture and filtration techniques, there is little documented experience with engineered on-site capture and filtration to support a preference for “naturalized systems and designs” in every case.</p> <p>Similarly, the strongly worded measures against new construction in wetlands, habitat areas, parks, near river systems, and flood-prone areas may be desirable, but should not constitute an outright prohibition, with hundreds of vacant, older but long-established legal building sites situated in such settings.</p> <p>The word “any” should be removed from the mitigation measures to address these concerns.</p> <p>Finally, the suggested expansion of natural flood control systems, such as wetlands</p>

	and riparian buffers, in areas where they do not currently exist is supportable, as long as it does not in any way mandate removal of existing engineered channel stretches as “mitigation” for road-building. In many cases, the only reason a new road can be built at all is that engineered channels have reduced flood hazards to that area.
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Communities Strategy Page 110	<p>One of the “Benefits to Public Health and the Environment” regards municipal water and sewer systems. The statement “..concrete stormwater channels harm water quality and sprawl eats into open space” is misleading, and is subject to Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations that vary by region. The following alternative language is suggested:</p> <p>Public health and environmental protection have long been linked to the way our region is planned and the way public services are delivered. Municipal water and sewer systems, for example, ensure clean water. At the same time, concrete stormwater runoff channels harm water quality <u>as areas become more urbanized and the percentage of impervious surface is increased, the hydrologic regime is dramatically altered. Drainage conveyances that once were natural and riparian are required to be engineered as hardened flood control channels to provide adequate protection of private property and public infrastructure from the increased frequency, duration, peak flow, and overall volume of stormwater runoff. With this armoring of once natural channels, water quality benefits from biofiltration are lost along with opportunities for infiltration and evapotranspiration, which can lead to hydromodification downstream in sections which are not yet engineered and hardened.</u> Many strategies contained in the RTP/SCS will provide widespread benefits within the region for both public health and environmental protection.</p>
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Program Environmental Impact Report	
Chapter 3.13 – Water Resources Pages 3.13-34 through 3.13-46	The PEIR includes 68 mitigation measures in the Water Resources section regarding water quality. At least 35 of these are related to stormwater runoff best management practices (BMPs) that are currently regulated through Municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permits issued by Regional Water Quality Control Boards. In the SCAG region there are five water quality control boards each with its own Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permit. The regulations and requirements contained in these permits vary from each other. By listing specific measures in the PEIR that are not included in a project’s applicable Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permit, the PEIR creates conflicting compliance requirements. To eliminate potential conflict with existing regulations, the mitigation measures regarding specific BMPs should be removed and replaced with a single requirement that each project must comply with its applicable Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permit.
Chapter 3.13 – Water Resources Pages 3.13-34 through 3.13-46	There are no specified limits to how small a project has to be to require mitigation. Measures MM-W9, MM-W24, MM-W32 and MM-W61 all suggest local jurisdictions regulate and limit the installation of new impervious patios, paved courtyards, pools, spas, open stairways, and walkways in private back yards, minimizing these as “non-roof impervious surfaces around the building,” or require “mitigation” such as restoring or expanding nearby wetlands or riparian buffer areas, upgrading nearby stormwater drainage facilities, or paying a “mitigation” fee for their related “impacts.” However, no court has held that wetlands and riparian buffers are “utilities” for which such fees could

	<p>be imposed without voter approval.</p> <p>MM-W11 further provides that “any areas disturbed along the riparian corridor should be replanted with mature native riparian vegetation.” This measure lacks specificity as to the boundaries or width of a riparian corridor.</p> <p>In many cases, areas in Southern California along riparian corridors are infested with invasive periwinkle, and Department of Fish and Game biologists would prefer bare ground after removal so that natural recruitment from the remaining specimens of native groundcover may occur. It is in fact impossible to replace a “mature” native groundcover in a riparian area without further disturbing stream banks. It is also unreasonable to require the replacement of a tree that has been approved for removal by the California Department of Fish and Game.</p>
	<p>MM-W12 provides that roadway construction projects comply with the CalTrans stormwater discharge permit. MM-W20 suggests local road projects both comply with the CalTrans permit and incorporate median strips. Orange County’s Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permits, as issued, contain entirely different and conflicting requirements for road projects. Specifically, the County is required to follow the EPA Greenstreets Handbook for road improvement projects. The EPA Greenstreets Handbook does not identify median strips as an option.</p>
	<p>MM-W13 provides that NPDES compliance requires a “Construction-Permit-Phase Stormwater Supplemental Form.” MM-W13 further directs “non-landscape based stormwater treatment measures” be compared in each individual case to landscape-based treatment measures. Orange County’s Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permit requirements for construction, new development and significant redevelopment, as issued, contain entirely different and conflicting requirements. The County’s program utilizes customized forms, procedures, and means of assessment.</p> <p>MM-W17 suggests structural stormwater runoff treatment should be pursued where such treatment facilities will be operated by a municipality. Orange County’s Municipal NPDES Stormwater Permit program focuses on the private sector operating all site specific treatment control facilities, unless they are regional in nature.</p> <p>MM-W30 requires filter fabrics over storm drain inlets for all site dewatering. If the approved volume of dewatering is large, it may not be possible to maintain a filter fabric over the inlet at all times. Reference to regional water board-approved general dewatering permits would represent superior language.</p> <p>MM-W48 requires the implementation of water conservation through many measures that are regulated under the Green Building Code.</p>
	<p>The following measures fail to make the critical distinction between regulating runoff from development sites and limiting changes to those sites.</p> <p>MM-W22 also speaks to hydrologic changes “induced” by flood plain encroachment. In fact, flood plain developments are engineered to survive storms of a given size, with protection that properly directs storm flows. There is no mechanism to assume standard flood engineering fails to prevent in-stream hydrologic changes, and then ask for more such engineering.</p>

	<p>MM-W29 requires that stormwater runoff never be increased to adjoining properties or a nearby creek. Engineered runoff flowing in a controlled manner to an adjoining property is almost always allowed, when the owner of that property gives consent.</p> <p>MM-W58 indicates that the purpose of low impact development is to maintain the existing hydrology of the site. LID, as currently practiced, replicates the pre-development runoff from a site by on-site retention, but does not mimic pre-development hydrology within a site.</p>
	<p>MM-W30 requires “replanting of the (graded) area with native vegetation as soon as possible.” Replanting would occur with the approved plant palette, likely with drought-tolerant materials, but not necessarily native vegetation.</p> <p>MM-W48 establishes a minimum irrigation system distribution uniformity of 75%, which would basically prohibit the use of lower cost sprayheads, which rarely attain a “DU” greater than 50%.</p> <p>MM-W51 and MM-W55 provide that homeowners upgrading existing homes would be required to install automatic sprinkler systems and soil moisture controllers. MM-W66 appears to require existing homeowners seeking permits to improve their homes to cover over any area of exposed ground on their properties with mulch, or install edible materials for “local” consumption. All of these measures may go beyond the State Model Landscape Ordinance, absent a definition of significant redevelopment and, in the case of MM-W66, by covering all bare ground, actually prevent natural recruitment from specimens of native groundcover.</p>
	<p>MM-W65 appears to require local jurisdictions to “install forests.” This requirement is extreme and unattainable, particularly in arid climes where forests never naturally existed</p>
AREA OF CONCERN: ROAD TRANSPORTATION	
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Highways and Arterials Supplemental Report	
Programmed Commitments Page 2, Table 1	<p>With respect to Orange County, Sample Major Highway Projects listed in Table 1 for in the FTIP identify improvements to I-5 (HOV Lanes from South of Avenida Pico to South of Avenida Vista, completion year 2020) and I-405 (Mixed Flow Lanes from SR-73 to I-605, completion year 2018). It is presumed that Caltrans is lead on these projects and there is no local match/investment requirement.</p>
Programmed Commitments Page 3, Table 2	<p>In Table 2, additional county commitments are identified. Therein, there is reference to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HOV Lanes - Reconfiguring the Avenida Pico Interchange at the I-5 in San Clemente – completion year 2014. 2. Toll Lanes - Constructing HOV/HOT connectors for SR-91/SR241 – completion year 2018. 3. Mixed Flow Lanes – Reconfiguring the interchanges at Avery Parkway and La Paz

	<p>in Mission Viejo – completion year 2020. There is also mention of improving the interchange at SR-91/SR-55 and Lakeview Avenue in Anaheim – completion year 2023.</p> <p>It is presumed that Caltrans is lead on these projects and there is no local match/investment requirement. (These projects are not listed in OC Public Works/7-year Transportation Capital Improvement Program, BOS Approved on 6-28-2011.)</p>
<p>Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Project List Supplemental Report</p>	
<p>Page 2, Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Project List (Table)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FTIP ORA120357 - Orange County, Traffic signal Synchronization for Bus Rapid Transit Corridors, Route 0 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is funding tied to OC Public Works/Road's Antonio Parkway Corridor Traffic Signal Synchronization programmed for FY 2012-13? Coordination between OCTA and OC Public Works/Road is recommended. 2. FTIP ORA120326 Route 5 and FTIP ORA000152, FTIP 120506 and ORA120507 on Route 74 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment/Question: Is funding tied to OC Public Works/Road's La Pata Avenue (Engineering) and La Pata Avenue NEPA (permitting) projects programmed for FY 2011-12, Pata Avenue Land Acquisition programmed for FY 2012-13 and La Pata Avenue (construction) programmed for FY 2013-14? 3. FTIP 2A0804 and ORA082401 Route 0, Cow Camp Road from FTC to Ortega <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is funding tied to OC Public Works/Road's Cow Camp Road Segment 1 (Engineering) programmed for FY 2011-12, Cow Camp Road – Segment 1 (Construction) and Cow Camp Road Segment II (Engineering) programmed for FY 2012-13, and Cow Camp Road – Segment II (Construction) programmed for FY 2013-14 4. FTIP ORA82406 Antonio Parkway Build Out between Ladera Planned Communities to Ortega Highway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not shown listed in OC Public Works/7-year Transportation Capital Improvement Program, BOS Approved on 6-28-2011. 5. FTIP ORA120505 Alton Parkway Improvements - Irvine Blvd to Commercentre Drive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not shown listed in OC Public Works/7-year Transportation Capital Improvement Program, BOS Approved on 6-28-2011. • Coordination with County required – Adjacent to James A Musick Branch Jail 6. FTIP ORA120523 on Route 0, Placentia – Richfied Ave. – Atwood Channel Bridge Widening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with OCFCD required. 7. FTIP ORA020826 on Route 0, Tustin Ave/rose Drive Grade Separation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with County and OCFCD required. 8. FTIP ORA100603 on Route 0, Santa Ana River Trail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with OCFCD required. 9. Financially-Constrained RTP Projects, 210 10. RTP ORA120357 Orange County Traffic signal Synchronization for Bus Rapid Transit Corridors – see FTIP Projects above 11. RTP ORA120326 Route 5 – see FTIP Projects above 12. RTP ORA120523 Richfield Avenue – see FTIP Projects above, completion FY 2012 13. RTP 2A0705 Signal Synchronization Program – see FTIP ORA120357 above,

	<p>completion FY 2035</p> <p>14. RTP 2L220 Non-motorized, completion FY 2035</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No projects are identified in OC Public Works/Road 7 year CIP. <p>15. RTP 2A0804 Cow Camp Road, completion FY 2018 – see FTIP Projects listed above</p> <p>Laguna Canyon Road Projects identified in OC Public Works 7 year CIP for FY 2011-12 (SR-73 to I-405 and SR-73 to El Toro Road) were not identified in the report nor was that for the El Toro Road widening from Glen Ranch Road to Live Oak Canyon currently programmed for FY 2014-15.</p>
<p>Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy</p> <p>Program Environmental Impact Report</p>	
<p>Chapter 3.12 – Transportation, Traffic, and Security</p> <p>Pages 3.12-30 through 3.12-43</p>	<p>Several of the mitigation measures include actions on the part of SCAG that appear to be outside of their purview or may result in the loss of local control:</p> <p>MM-TR4 – Emergency repairs are under the purview of local jurisdictions. May be outside of SCAG's purview.</p> <p>MM-TR5 – Is SCAG making a commitment to provide this technology to local jurisdictions?</p> <p>MM-TR6 – Is SCAG to become another reviewing entity with approval authority of grant funds such as Caltrans and OCTA?</p> <p>MM-TR7 – May be outside of SCAG's purview to plan for and respond to terrorist incidents and natural or human-caused disasters.</p> <p>MM-TR8 – May be outside of SCAG's purview to plan for and respond to terrorist incidents and natural or human-caused disasters.</p> <p>MM-TR9 – Purview of Federal and State authorities.</p> <p>MM-TR10 – Purview of Federal and State authorities. May be viewed as another layer of bureaucracy.</p> <p>MM-TR13 – May be outside of SCAG's purview to plan for regional emergencies.</p> <p>MM-TR15 – Charging for peak auto trips.</p> <p>MM-TR17 – Implementing programs to reduce employee trips should be left to the local jurisdictions.</p> <p>MM-TR18 – Providing incentives for employee ride-sharing programs is problematic given the current economy and budget realities.</p> <p>MM-TR19 – Providing incentives for car sharing programs is problematic given the current economy and budget realities.</p> <p>MM-TR20 – Providing incentives for employee vanpool programs is problematic given the current economy and budget realities.</p> <p>MM-TR21 – Regional transportation plans tie inter modal systems together. SCAG should support revisions to Master Plans of Arterial Highways for local jurisdictions.</p> <p>MM-TR28 – Measures relating to Transportation Demand Management plans are already carried out by local entities.</p>

	<p>MM-TR29 – Measures relating to traffic management strategies are already carried out by local entities.</p> <p>MM-TR33 – Traffic control plans required for encroachment permits are under the purview of local jurisdictions.</p> <p>MM-TR34 – What will be the consequence of a local jurisdiction not meeting and identified transportation-related benchmark? Will this impact local grants, etc?</p> <p>MM-TR35 – What will be the consequence of a local jurisdiction not establishing a parking policy that discourages private vehicle use?</p> <p>MM-TR55 – Under the purview of regional transportation agencies to conduct public outreach regarding transportation issues.</p> <p>MM-TR60 – Impact fees on new development will increase the cost of housing.</p> <p>MM-TR62 – Under the purview of regional transportation agencies to monitor congestion.</p> <p>MM-TR66 – What will be the consequence of a local jurisdiction not limiting delivery hours for local business? May cause local businesses to relocate elsewhere.</p> <p>MM-TR76 – Modifying development standards to accommodate bicycle use to this extent will increase costs to the local jurisdiction and increase costs of development.</p> <p>MM-TR77 – Modifying development standards to accommodate bicycle use to this extent will increase costs to the local jurisdiction and increase costs of development.</p> <p>MM-TR78 – Local jurisdictions may not have the funding to provide these types of multi-use trails.</p> <p>MM-TR79 – May be outside of purview of local jurisdiction to provide bicycle safety training.</p> <p>MM-TR80 – Impact fees on new development to fund bicycle facilities will increase the cost of housing.</p> <p>MM-TR83 – What will be the consequence of a local jurisdiction not establishing a parking policy that discourages private vehicle use?</p> <p>MM-TR88 – Local jurisdictions may not have the resources to establish incentives to encourage the use of electric vehicles or to build outdoor wired facilities for these vehicles.</p> <p>MM-TR92 – Local jurisdictions may not have the resources to purchase expensive electric or hybrid vehicles at the time replacements are needed.</p> <p>MM-TR95 – Local jurisdictions may not have the resources to provide “bicycle stations” which may not be used by many residents.</p> <p>MM-TR96 – What will be the consequence of a local jurisdiction not establishing a parking policy that discourages private vehicle use?</p> <p>MM-TR97 – Local jurisdictions cannot be held responsible for the air travel completed by employees of businesses in their jurisdictions.</p>
AREA OF CONCERN: WASTE AND RECYCLING	
Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	

Program Environmental Impact Report

The decomposition of municipal solid waste produces landfill gas that can be converted into electricity due its high heating value. Capturing landfill gas reduces emissions into the atmosphere. In addition, generating electricity from landfill gas provides an indirect benefit by avoiding the need to use non-renewable resources such as coal, oil, or natural gas to produce the same amount of energy. The practice of electrical generation from biomass sources has been recognized by the State as a form of renewable energy, similar to solar, wind, and hydro-electric projects. With the passage of SBX1 2 in 2011, investor and publicly owned utility companies will be required to meet a renewable portfolio standard of 33% by 2020. As of 2010, most utility companies were well below 20%. The utilization of landfill gas to energy producing projects will play a prominent role for utility companies to achieve the State mandated renewable portfolio standard. In Orange County alone, the County's three active landfills generate 12 megawatts-hours of electricity, enough to power 9,000 homes. In addition, there are plans to increase that energy output to 64 megawatts-hours within the next few years.

Page 3.11-22	California Integrated Waste Management Act, in 2011 the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed into law AB 341 which established a statewide policy goal of diverting 75% of all waste generated in the State by 2020. AB 341 builds upon AB 939 and establishes a nexus between recycling and AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act by reducing five million metric tons of CO2 equivalent by diverting approximately two million tons of solid waste per year. This will be achieved by requiring cities and counties to work with the business community and multi-family dwelling units to implement commercial recycling programs thereby avoiding the extraction of raw materials, preprocessing and manufacturing of virgin materials. In effect, this ensures that only residual waste that has no economic value will be landfilled. The policy implication of AB 341 is the development of new recycling programs and infrastructure while preserving the capacity of the landfills throughout the State.
Page 3.11-22	The agency name for the California Integrated Waste Management Board has changed to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).
Page 3.11-24	Under the subsection "Orange County", CalRecycle approved Orange County's 5-year update of the Orange County CIWMP in January 2011. It should also be noted that there is now an operational materials recovery facility in south Orange County. The facility is located at the County's Prima Deshecha Landfill and is operated by CR&R Disposal. This facility accepts construction and demolition waste materials and has a mandatory diversion rate of 80 percent. It should also be noted that both the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill and the Olinda Alpha Landfill, which are both owned and operated by the County, have already received all necessary permits and entitlements for their expansions. As such, the closure date for the Olinda Alpha Landfill is in December 2021 and the closure date for the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill is in December 2053. It should also be noted that Orange County has sufficient solid waste disposal capacity throughout the RTP/planning period (2012-2035).
Page 3.11-25	Solid Waste Disposal and Transfer Facilities, it should be noted that Orange County can only accept imported solid waste materials from outside of Orange County under the specified terms and conditions of Orange County's bankruptcy recovery. Under the terms and conditions of the bankruptcy recovery, importation of solid waste materials will end in June 2016.

Page 3.11-26	Table 3.11-8: Permitted Active Solid Waste Landfills in the SCAG Region: the following information regarding the Orange County landfill system should be changed to the following: Frank R. Bowerman Landfill, closure date of December 31, 2053, maximum permitted daily tonnage of 11,500 tons per day, total landfill airspace capacity of 266,000,000 cubic yards as of June 30, 2011, remaining landfill airspace capacity of 198,000,000 cubic yards as of June 30, 2011; Olinda Alpha Landfill, total landfill airspace capacity of 148,800,000 cubic yards, remaining landfill airspace capacity of 47,700,000 cubic yards; Prima Deshecha Landfill, total landfill airspace capacity of 172,000,000 cubic yards, remaining landfill airspace capacity of 133,000,000 cubic yards.
Page 3.11-27	Waste Diversion and Recycling: This section appears outdated with the last diversion rate reported in 2002. It is therefore suggested that this section be updated with 2010 information which is available at CalRecycle's website at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/GoalMeasure/DisposalRate/MostRecent/default.htm . In 2010, California's statewide diversion rate was approximately 65% based on the per resident disposal rate.
Page 3.11-28	<p>Impacts: The waste generation and disposal projections for the 2010-2035 timeframe within the SCAG region should be re-evaluated. According to CalRecycle, the amount of waste disposed in landfills for each resident on average was 4.5 pounds of waste per day. Given that the resident "equivalent diversion rate" in 2010 was about 65%, each resident threw away or generated 12.85 pounds per day of waste per day. This equates to Californians generating approximately 85 to 90 million tons of waste and disposing of approximately 30 million of waste in landfills. SCAG's RTP report appears to confuse the terms generation and disposal for purposes of estimating diversion rates and future waste projections.</p> <p>Similarly, the 2035 waste projection of 105.7 million pounds of waste per day within SCAG's region appears to be inflated. This value appears to have been calculated based on adding the 2010 residential and employee disposal rates. Adding these values together double counts the quantity of waste buried since each indicator represents the same waste stream. The residential and employee disposal rate established by CalRecycle was simply to normalize the data based on total statewide generation and disposal. Therefore, these parameters were meant to present different ways of looking at the same data but were not meant to be additive. The amount of waste generated and disposed in 2035 should be based on either parameter but not both.</p>
Page 3.11-30	Mitigation Measure MM-PS37: OC Waste & Recycling does not support this SCAG mitigation measure which discourages the siting of new solid waste landfills. While no new public or private solid waste landfills in Orange County are planned at this time, the siting of public or private solid waste landfills within the SCAG planning area, in the long-term, would provide a beneficial increase in solid waste landfill capacity for those jurisdictions that have limited or no solid waste landfill capacity.
Page 3.11-30	Mitigation Measure MM-PS38: OC Waste & Recycling does not support this SCAG mitigation measure which discourages the exportation of locally generated waste outside of the SCAG region during the construction and implementation of projects. In the long-term, waste-by-rail landfills located outside of the SCAG region may be viable

	long-term options for jurisdictions that have limited or no solid waste landfill capacity.
Page 3.11-30	OC Waste & Recycling strongly disagrees with the portion of this mitigation measure that states: "Disposal within the county where the waste originates can and should be encouraged as much as possible." As stated above, Orange County currently receives imported solid waste materials from private solid waste hauling companies as part of Orange County's bankruptcy recovery. Importation of solid wastes into Orange County will continue until June 2016. OC Waste & Recycling therefore recommends that SCAG revise this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measures Duplicative of Existing Laws and Regulations

Air Quality/ AQMD	California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Federal and State Law	Federal law	Resource Agencies
MM-AQ1	MM-BIO/OS1	MM-HM3	MM-LU14	MM-TR33
MM-AQ2	MM-BIO/OS3	MM-HM4	MM-LU30	MM-BIO/OS29
MM-AQ3	MM-BIO/OS4	MM-HM5		MM-BIO/OS30
MM-AQ4	MM-BIO/OS8	MM-HM6		MM-BIO/OS31
MM-AQ5	MM-BIO/OS10	MM-HM7	NPDES	MM-BIO/OS32
MM-AQ6	MM-BIO/OS11	MM-LU28	MM-AQ16	MM-BIO/OS33
MM-AQ7	MM-BIO/OS17	MM-NO18	MM-BIO/OS19	MM-BIO/OS34
MM-AQ8	MM-BIO/OS18	MM-PS13	MM-GEO5	MM-BIO/OS35
MM-AQ9	MM-BIO/OS21	MM-W36	MM-W1	MM-BIO/OS50
MM-AQ10	MM-BIO/OS22	MM-W37	MM-W13	MM-BIO/OS51
MM-AQ11	MM-BIO/OS23	MM-W38	MM-W58	
MM-AQ12	MM-BIO/OS24			
MM-AQ13	MM-BIO/OS25		Flood control	
MM-AQ14	MM-BIO/OS26		MM-HM8	
MM-AQ17	MM-BIO/OS27			
MM-AQ18	MM-BIO/OS28		Local Agencies	
	MM-BIO/OS14		MM-AV11	
	MM-BIO/OS7			
State Law				
MM-AV3	MM-HM10	MM-PS4	MM-PS107	MM-W25
MM-AV6	MM-HM11	MM-PS8	MM-PS113	MM-W26

MM-AV12	MM-HM12	MM-PS10	MM-PS119	MM-W27
MM-BIO/OS20	MM-HM13	MM-PS12	MM-PS122	MM-W28
MM-CUL1	MM-HM14	MM-PS14	MM-TR29	MM-W29
MM-CUL2	MM-HM15	MM-PS16	MM-TR49	MM-W30
MM-CUL3	MM-HM16	MM-PS35	MM-TR55	MM-W31
MM-CUL4	MM-LU10	MM-PS36	MM-TR75	MM-W32
MM-CUL5	MM-LU11	MM-PS37	MM-TR89	MM-W39
MM-CUL6	MM-LU17	MM-PS42	MM-W6	MM-W43
MM-CUL7	MM-LU19	MM-PS43	MM-W8	MM-W46
MM-CUL8	MM-LU20	MM-PS48	MM-W9	MM-W47
MM-CUL9	MM-LU38	MM-PS55	MM-W10	MM-W48
MM-CUL10	MM-LU43	MM-PS56	MM-W11	MM-W49
MM-CUL11	MM-LU44	MM-PS57	MM-W12	MM-W50
MM-CUL12	MM-LU48	MM-PS59	MM-W15	MM-W51
MM-CUL13	MM-LU58	MM-PS61	MM-W16	MM-W52
MM-CUL15	MM-NO1	MM-PS67	MM-W17	MM-W54
MM-CUL16	MM-NO4	MM-PS69	MM-W18	MM-W55
MM-GEO1	MM-NO8	MM-PS71	MM-W19	MM-W56
MM-GEO2	MM-NO9	MM-PS73	MM-W20	MM-W61
MM-GEO3	MM-POP2	MM-PS77	MM-W21	MM-W62
MM-GEO4	MM-POP4	MM-PS89	MM-W22	MM-W64
MM-GEO6	MM-PS1	MM-PS92	MM-W23	MM-W66
MM-HM9	MM-PS2	MM-PS97	MM-W24	MM-W68

Mitigation Measures Containing Policies

MM BIO/OS 44	MM LU 56	MM PS 25
MM BIO/OS 45	MM LU 57	MM PS 37
MM BIO/OS 46	MM LU 60	MM PS 39
MM BIO/OS 48	MM LU 61	MM PS 41
MM GHG 3	MM LU 64	MM PS 67
MM GHG 8	MM LU 65	MM PS 68
MM GHG 11	MM LU 69	MM PS 71
MM LU 9	MM LU 71	MM PS 95
MM LU 21	MM LU 74	MM PS 121
MM LU 22	MM LU 75	MM TR 17
MM LU 24	MM LU 77	MM TR 23
MM LU 26	MM LU 80	MM TR 28
MM LU 32	MM LU 81	MM TR 83
MM LU 34	MM LU 82	MM TR 85
MM LU 41	MM LU 83	MM W 34
MM LU 42	MM NO 12	MM W 59
MM LU 47	MM NO 16	MM W 60
MM LU 48	MM POP 1	MM W 65
MM LU 51	MM PS 3	
MM LU 53	MM PS 14	