

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

October 21, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:09 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance. Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Kellejian mentioned that he would like to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 a.m. so that Committee members will have time to view and ride the demonstration bus rapid transit (BRT) vehicle that will be waiting on a nearby street.

### 1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Deputy Mayor Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the September 2, 2005, meeting.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Kellejian referred to a memo in the agenda package for Item No. 2 and asked Toni Bates, Division Director of Transit Planning, to provide a report.

Ms. Bates stated that the memo is a response to a question asked by the Transportation Committee at its March 4, 2005, meeting, on the possibility of combining the environmental analysis for a potential magnetic levitation (MagLev) passenger system along Interstate 5 (I-5) with the environmental document currently underway for the North Coast I-5 Study. At its July 15 meeting, the Committee approved seeking federal funds for the study of high-speed MagLev service along the I-5, I-15, and I-8 corridors. As a result, the Committee asked about the implications of including a high-speed MagLev alternative in the preliminary engineering and environmental work currently underway for the North Coast I-5 Project. Ms. Bates stated that the memo responds to that question and concludes that past feasibility studies have identified a number of potential environmental issues in the I-5 corridor. The Caltrans North Coast I-5 Project Study is focused on freeway-related improvements, including managed lanes and general purpose lane projects, and the scope of the study does not include alternatives or analysis related to conventional or high-speed rail. Due to the identified impacts of MagLev or high-speed rail in the corridor, including these rail alternatives in the North Coast I-5 Project Study would negatively affect the schedule of the North Coast I-5 Study and is not advised.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, said that he was not present at the September 2, 2005, joint Transportation/Regional Planning Committee meeting due to a conflict with a meeting of the Subcommittee for Accessible Transportation (SCAT). At the SCAT meeting, he heard of an accessibility problem on the Green Line from Noel Neudeck. Apparently, Mr. Neudeck cannot access the ticket from the machine himself. Mr. Lungerhausen noted that he also is a member of the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC), and this same topic was raised at a meeting of that body as well. He expects it will come up at the MTS Accessibility Services Advisory Committee (ASAC) meeting scheduled for September 22. Mr. Lungerhausen thought that he would be fairly well informed on this subject by that time. He expressed disappointment that this problem is being experienced on such a new system and hoped it can be resolved.

Councilmember Monroe asked Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, about the status of this problem. Mr. Jablonski said that the issue has been forwarded to Cubic Corporation, the manufacturer of the fare machines. Cubic believes that the machines are compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Unfortunately, we cannot design everything we do to be accessible for every type of disability. There are a number of disabilities that prevent people from doing a whole host of activities. This is the only complaint that has been received. We will work with SANDAG to provide a more formal response to Mr. Neudeck. Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director, added that we have been responding to Mr. Neudeck with a steady stream of letters.

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Inland) asked that Consent Item No. 4 be pulled for a comment.

3. **BUDGET TRANSFER TO IMPLEMENT LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT VEHICLE TRACKING BETWEEN BALTIMORE JUNCTION AND SANTEE TOWNE CENTER (APPROVE)**

The Transportation Committee was asked to approve a budget transfer in an amount not to exceed \$150,000 from the SD100 Modification Project (Capital Improvement Program [CIP] project number 1140400) to Train Location Project (CIP project number 1140300) to allow construction of a light rail transit (LRT) vehicle tracking system on a portion of the Green Line under the Spring Street Curves Project.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Deputy Mayor Emery, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item No. 3.

4. **BI-ANNUAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REPORT (INFORMATION)**

The report summarizes the results of SANDAG's efforts to coordinate transit and land use through the project development review process for the period between January and June 2005. SANDAG staff works closely with local jurisdictions to ensure the integration of transit facilities into development projects and to improve the pedestrian environment wherever possible. During the period, these efforts resulted in the inclusion of \$1.38 million worth of privately funded transit and pedestrian facilities.

Councilmember Ritter asked for a written list of projects and their geographic locations.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Ritter and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 4, with direction to staff to provide a written list of projects and geographic locations to Transportation Committee members.

## **CHAIR'S REPORT**

### **5. NABI BUS RAPID TRANSIT VEHICLE ON DISPLAY (INFORMATION)**

Chair Kellejian stated that I-15 will be the first corridor in our region where we will marry transit and highway improvements using BRT. BRT will provide a high-quality transit service along our managed lanes with upgraded customer amenities on vehicles and at stations. SANDAG and the transit agencies will be identifying the qualities and characteristics desired for our BRT vehicles. We also have been keeping track of other agencies using these vehicles. The Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority (LAMTA) recently purchased 200 vehicles for its new San Fernando Valley BRT service from North American Bus Industries (NABI). The LAMTA service is scheduled to begin operation this fall. Today we have one of those buses on display outside the building for Committee members to see and ride following this meeting. The bus is articulated with 57 seats, which is a 45 percent increase over a standard bus. It has low floors and wide doors to make boarding and alighting easier for passengers. The bus is powered by a 320 horse-powered compressed natural gas (CNG) engine. LAMTA paid \$633,000 for each of the 200 buses. About 30 vehicles were delivered in June, and the remainder will be received by June 2006.

Supervisor Roberts asked about the difference between this bus and another articulated bus. Ms. Bates said that this bus has low floors and wider doors. It is an attempt by the manufacturing industry to design more sleek-looking buses. What we are finding is that the bus manufacturing industry is having a hard time responding to the desires of transit agencies across the nation and around the world for BRT vehicle design and amenities. This bus will be employed in large volumes on a high-speed busway. She added that the manufacturer will be available at the demonstration and will be able to provide details about the vehicle to Committee members.

## **REPORTS**

### **6. NCTD AND MTS SECURITY PROCEDURES (INFORMATION)**

Mr. Jablonski introduced Bill Burke, San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI), Director of Security, and Peter Tereschuck, General Manager of SDTI.

Mr. Burke stated that the vast majority of security efforts are associated with the trolley, but they are expanding it to buses as well. He reviewed the security/code compliance functions, security staff categories and patrol practices, security awareness measures, special enforcement unit, inspection statistics, crime statistics reporting, closed-circuit television

(CCTV), central monitoring, criminal investigations assisted by CCTV, the Terrorism Alert Response Program (TARP), Emergency Response Orientation, emergency drills, and robotic testing at the San Diego State University (SDSU) Station.

Mr. Burke mentioned that a question has arisen about why SDTI doesn't have an arrangement with a police force or the Sheriff's Department, and the reason is primarily due to cost. He said that they spend about \$6 million on the entire security function, and it would cost anywhere from \$15-\$18 million to contract with a police department or the Sheriff's Office. Mr. Burke stated that SDTI Code Compliance officers do not carry guns; however, contracted security personnel do, and it is a liability carried by the contracting agency.

Mr. Burke stated that they are in continual communications with the various local law enforcement agencies. SDTI has a huge database of people related to various system violations, and this information is shared with law enforcement agencies when requested. There are inspections both onboard vehicles and in the fare paid zones. These efforts work together to ensure that our fare compliance rate remains high. All trains and passengers are inspected bi-directionally each month. Security officers have a choice of giving a warning or writing a citation. Providing a warning gives passengers an opportunity to deboard and purchase a fare or upgrade the fare. This action relieves court overcrowding, is a good public relations move, and provides additional income. Security personnel provide information to patrons as well.

Mr. Burke said that they are hoping to get more CCTVs installed in La Mesa and Chula Vista. The costs are shared by the community and MTS.

Chair Kellejian commented that the security force at Old Town has been very helpful. In addition to security, they also provide information to patrons about the transit system.

Chair Kellejian asked what the policy is for a rider without a ticket. Mr. Burke said that security officers have the discretion of taking people off the train and giving them the opportunity to purchase a ticket, or to cite them with a ticket. If the inspector feels that the person is a tourist and is not familiar with the system, he/she may allow them to continue to ride.

Chair Kellejian asked if there is a public address (PA) system at the stations. Mr. Burke responded affirmatively.

Mayor Mary Sessom (San Diego Regional County Airport Authority) asked if SDTI security is tied into the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS). Mr. Burke replied that it is not. Mr. Gallegos noted that we have been talking to ARJIS about including both of the transit operators into the ARJIS system.

Mr. Jablonski compared the fare evasion rate of our barrier-free fare system of 3.21 percent to that of a barrier system like the Washington Metro at over 5 percent. This shows that having a barrier does not preclude fare evasion.

Mayor Madrid stated his opinion that security efforts seem to be reactive rather than proactive. He was glad to hear about these proactive efforts. He relayed several incidents that have occurred within the City of La Mesa. He was pleased to hear that La Mesa would be getting CCTV cameras; however, he didn't think the jurisdictions should have to participate in funding the cameras.

Mr. Burke played a short video of a crime that took place at the Old Town Transit Center and the role the CCTVs made in the capture of the criminals.

Karen King introduced Dave Papworth, NCTD's Manager of Security. She said their security focus is on prevention and response, especially in light of recent bombings at transit facilities in Europe. She stated that Homeland Security dollars have been slow in coming to transit operators. We need to keep a focus on enforcing the regulations and move people in a way wherein they feel safe and secure.

Mr. Papworth reviewed the details of their security efforts in four areas: deployment, projects, activity, and training. He said that they have a security contract with Heritage Security. He noted that they also enjoy favorable relationships with the local law enforcement agencies in their area.

Mr. Papworth reviewed several projects implemented with a 2004 Urban Area Security Initiatives grant from the Department of Homeland Security, including infrastructure improvements such as increased capacity in the fiber optic backbone, surveillance system improvements at all COASTER stations, new cameras at the Old Town and Santa Fe Depot stations, and fencing improvements at Stuart Mesa. He noted that they are in the process of applying for a 2005 grant. He also reviewed activities they are involved in with various law enforcement groups and the various types of training that is provided. Mr. Papworth explained the current security programs underway.

Deputy Mayor Emery asked if the NCTD camera installation at the Old Town and Santa Fe Depot Stations was done in conjunction with MTS. Mr. Papworth replied that they were installed and controlled by NCTD. Deputy Mayor Emery suggested that this could have been an opportunity for a joint effort.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. REGIONAL VANPOOL PROGRAM REPORT (APPROVE)

Ray Traynor, Senior Planner, provided an outline on this item with background information, issues, and recommended strategies in two areas: proposed operating principles and funding priorities. He said that vanpools are one of the key elements of the region's transportation demand management (TDM) strategy. This system has three goals: reduce congestion, improve air quality, and encourage solo drivers to become van riders. He said that vanpools have about a 70 percent cost recovery rate. He described how the program works, and noted that it serves a niche market of long-distance commuters. He added that the average one-way commute trip of a vanpool is 58 miles. The SANDAG Board approved an FY 2006 budget amount of \$2.4 million. This is an increase over the prior year, it clears the waiting list of requested vanpools that was created in FY 2005, and provides capacity to

add about six new vans per month. The current policy for new vanpool startups is on a first come, first serve basis.

Mr. Traynor reviewed several issues related to the vanpool program: the employer-owned vanpool programs at both the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and Southern California Edison have recently been contracted to third parties; employees are seeking additional subsidies which could tap into the FY 2006 budget; and SANDAG may have to defer or deny participation in order to stay within the current budget. Because there are no formal operating principles in place, staff has no means of prioritizing which vanpools should be allowed into the program. Mr. Traynor recommended that the Transportation Committee adopt operating principles and funding priorities to guide implementation of the vanpool program in support of adopted strategies in the I-15 Interregional Partnership and the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He reviewed the proposed formal operating principles and three funding options for this program. He showed the geographic origin-destinations of the various existing vanpools and noted that nearly 50 percent of vanpools originated from locations outside of San Diego County, with the majority from southwestern Riverside County.

Mr. Traynor reviewed the various funding priorities as follows. Option 1 would fund: (1) existing vanpools, (2) vanpools that have both an origin and destination within San Diego County, (3) vanpools commuting **into** San Diego County, and (4) vanpools commuting **out of** San Diego County. Option 2 would fund: (1) existing vanpools, (2) vanpools that have both an origin and destination within San Diego County, (3) vanpools **out of** San Diego County, and (4) vanpools **into** San Diego County. Option 3 would fund: (1) existing vanpools, and (2) vanpools on a first come, first serve basis. He reviewed the recommendations to approve the operating principles and Funding Priority Option 1. He reviewed the next steps to implement the approved Operating Principles and Funding Priority and to prepare a report to address the long-term financing of the program as part of the FY 2007 budget.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks (NCTD) asked if additional new Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 money has been generated by this program. Mr. Gallegos agreed that was the case but said that we also use those dollars for transit operations.

Councilmember Monroe stated that a copy of an e-mail to First Vice Chair Sessom contained an erroneous premise. Mr. Gallegos said that all three funding options would deal with all three types of requests.

Supervisor Roberts asked if there was a minimum number of passengers required for a vanpool. Mr. Traynor responded that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) defines it as five, and our program requires a minimum of six passengers.

Supervisor Roberts commented that the \$1.65 subsidy compares favorably to public transit. He expressed concern about the vanpool that only comes into San Diego County for a short distance, and suggested that another category be developed as the second priority that a vanpool's destination has to be a minimum of 20 miles into the county.

Councilmember Stocks suggested an alternative that a vanpool has to terminate in a congested area within San Diego County. He thought those vanpools going out of San Diego County should be broken out as well. A fourth category would include trips that are less than 20 miles into or out of San Diego County.

Mayor Madrid asked about the sentence in the report related to reducing the number of subsidies offered in order to use the dwindling vanpool budget. Mr. Gallegos stated that we are receiving more money in FTA Section 5307 funds, which are used by the two transit agencies for operations. SANDAG and the region fronts the money for vanpools; in the past we have used a combination of FTA Section 5307, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and vehicle license fee program funds. We compete nationally for the Section 5307 dollars. Our analysis shows that as a result of the additional miles gained from the vanpool program, we get about a 3 to 1 benefit and more overall Section 5307 dollars for the region.

Ms. King indicated that NCTD supports vanpools and TDM measures because public transit buses and trains cannot serve every need, and both NCTD and MTS have deliberately reduced their bus miles in recent years to be more efficient and to increase productivity on those miles we travel. Mr. Gallegos added that we report to the federal government the number of people in these vanpools, how many miles are traveled, and how many vehicles are in service.

Public Comment:

Mike DeMarco, a member of the public, said that he lives in Oceanside and commutes daily through San Diego County on SR 78 and I-5 to Los Angeles. He applied for a vanpool subsidy in July and was denied because he went 400 yards into another county. He is a little confused about the policy. He acknowledged some inaccuracies in the e-mail he sent. He suggested that the subsidy be based on a mileage tier.

Mr. Traynor said that vehicle miles traveled is one of the considerations contained in the proposed operating principles.

Councilmember Stocks pointed out that it is not about miles per se, but miles on congested freeways. We want the maximum bang for the buck. It is not appropriate for our regional dollars to fix Los Angeles' problem. He suggested that Option 1 be modified to add a caveat of miles traveled within San Diego County. He thought that the vast majority of commuters would agree with that. He also expressed disinterest in funding San Onofre's 50 vanpools.

Supervisor Roberts agreed that reverse commuters going out of the county have a lower priority than those coming into the county. We should create a fourth level of priority for commuters into or out of the county of less than 20 miles.

Motion Made

Supervisor Roberts moved to approve the staff recommendation with the revision to funding priority Option 1 modified to add a fourth level of priority for vanpools with less than 20 miles coming into or going out of San Diego County. Councilmember Madaffer seconded the motion.

Councilmember Madaffer sympathized with the speaker but thought the motion by Supervisor Roberts will address that. He added that if the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) wants to help fund inter-county vanpools, that would be great and we should explore this in the future. Mr. Gallegos said that we have started that dialogue and encourage our friends at the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to join in funding this program as well.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee adopted the proposed operating principles and funding priority Option 1, as modified, to guide the management of the Regional Vanpool Program within the approved FY 2006 budget.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, October 7, 2005, and Friday, October 21, 2005.

Chair Kellejian stated that many of the Committee members have a conflict with the October 7 meeting date. He will discuss this issue with staff and will get back to Committee members on the status of this meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:51 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 16, 2005**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of		Alternate	?	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	No	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	No	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	Yes	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	No	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	Yes	
	----	Scott Peters	Alternate	No	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	Yes	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes	
	MTS	Leon Williams	Alternate	No	
North County Transit District	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	Representing North County Inland
	City of Escondido	Ed Gallo	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Member	Yes	
	Governor's Appointee	Xema Jacobson	Alternate	No	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	No	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	Yes	
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group	—	Sandor Shapery	Member	Yes	