

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 4, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF OCTOBER 21, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:06 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance. Chair Kellejian asked Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jerome Stocks (North County Transit District [NCTD]) and a second by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the September 16, 2005, meeting.

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

Bill Figge, Caltrans, passed out a couple of upcoming meeting notices: a State of California Public Meeting on the Goods Movement Action Plan, scheduled for Saturday, October 29, 2005, at the Caltrans District 7 office in Los Angeles; and from the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, a meeting on October 27, 2005, at the San Diego Radisson Harborview. He invited Transportation Committee members to attend these meetings.

Mr. Sandy Shapery, a member of the public, expressed concern about the parking of transit buses along State Street adjacent to Emerald Plaza. He said this creates a negative impact to residents and businesses in this area. Two months ago, the parking meters were pulled out and the curbs painted red. However, there are 8-10 buses parked on both sides of State Street with their engines running. He was told this was happening because the buses that were parked along Pacific Highway had their schedules impacted by freight trains so they were moved to the State Street area. He suggested that the buses be parked in front of a public office rather than private enterprises.

Chair Kellejian asked Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, to respond to Mr. Shapery's concern. Mr. Jablonski replied that he had spoken with Mr. Shapery. Mr. Shapery said he was not satisfied with the response. Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) suggested that MTS provide Mr. Shapery with a better explanation of the situation.

Chair Kellejian noted that a memorandum from staff responding to a September 16, 2005, Transportation Committee question relating to the regional vanpool program was included in the agenda package.

### **CONSENT ITEMS (3 THROUGH 8)**

Chair Kellejian indicated that Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) requested that Item No. 6 be pulled from the Consent Calendar, and there was a correction to Item No. 7.

3. 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

At its meeting on July 23, 2004, the SANDAG Board adopted the 2004 RTIP, the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2005 to FY 2009. The Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration approved the 2004 RTIP on October 4, 2004. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis based on requests from member agencies. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2006-05, approving Amendment No. 12 to the 2004 RTIP.

4. AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF SAN DIEGO FOR EL CAJON BOULEVARD/I-15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) EARLY ACTION PROJECT ENHANCEMENTS (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to sign an agreement with the City of San Diego for the design and installation of conduit and substructures in advance for future electrical, communication, water, and other utilities needed for the future bus rapid transit (BRT) station on Interstate 15 (I-15) at El Cajon Boulevard.

5. ADDENDA TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN SANDAG, NCTD, AND MTS (RECOMMEND)

Two addenda are proposed to the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SANDAG, the North County Transit District (NCTD), and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Addenda 3 and 4 between SANDAG and NCTD, and SANDAG and MTS, respectively, formalize the methodology to be used for allocating funding to SANDAG for the administrative functions that transferred in consolidation. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve Addendum 3 and Addendum 4 to the Master MOU between SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS.

7. FREEWAY TRANSIT LANE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (INFORMATION)

SANDAG, in partnership with MTS, Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol (CHP), will embark on a demonstration project to evaluate the effectiveness of using the freeway shoulder lanes as a transit priority measure. The one-year demonstration project will be implemented on State Route (SR) 52 and Interstate 805 (I-805) between Kearny Mesa and University City using MTS Route 960. A "before and after" comparative evaluation will include assessment of operational safety for buses and auto drivers; transit travel times and

schedule reliability; transit ridership changes; and passenger, bus driver, and auto driver perceptions. This report describes the demonstration project that is scheduled to begin by November 2005.

Chair Kellejian said that the correction on Item No. 7 related to the timing of when the Freeway Transit Lane Demonstration project would commence, which is December rather than what was indicated in the agenda report (late October or early November).

8. UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS HEARINGS FOR TRANSIT DEPENDENT AND DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS (INFORMATION)

The Subcommittee for Accessible Transit (SCAT), appointed by the Board as the region's Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, will hold public hearings to receive comments on unmet transit needs in San Diego County, as required under Section 99238.5 of the California Public Utilities Code. Comments received will assist SANDAG and the region's transit operators in identifying the unmet transit needs of transit-dependent and transit-disadvantaged persons, including senior citizens, persons with disabilities, and persons who are economically disadvantaged. The information received will also be used as input to the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) that is now being prepared. A series of five meetings is being planned at locations in North County, San Diego (central and south), and East County. Comments will also be accepted via e-mail, US mail, and through SANDAG's Web site. Results of the hearings will be reported to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in December 2005.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 through 8, including Resolution No. 2006-5, the exclusion of Item No. 6, and the correction to Item No. 7.

6. AMENDMENTS TO *TransNet* POLICIES (RECOMMEND)

Amendments are proposed to *TransNet*-related policies previously adopted by the Board in its role as the Regional Transportation Commission in order to incorporate references to the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance. Additional changes are recommended for clarification purposes, and Policy No. 17, concerning fiscal and compliance audits, is being recommended as a new policy. If recommended for approval by the Transportation Committee, the proposed amendments and new policy will be taken to the SANDAG Board in November for final approval.

Councilmember Madaffer asked for a presentation on this item because there are substantial changes to policy. He asked if the changes had been reviewed by the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) or the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC). Craig Scott, *TransNet* Project Manager, replied that they had not, but noted that the changes are minor technical corrections to policies dating back to the early years of the first *TransNet* Ordinance. He said that most of the changes are minor updates or repeals of policies that have been superseded, and technical changes to connect policies relating the first *TransNet* Ordinance to the *TransNet Extension* Ordinance. There is only one new policy, which is related to an issue that has come up within the last year regarding the timely completion of audits. This new policy was not taken to the committees

because it is not a discretionary act, but is required to maintain compliance with the Ordinance.

Councilmember Madaffer asked at what point should issues be reviewed by the ITOC. Mr. Scott said that the ITOC did review Policy No. 16, related to the commercial paper expansion proposal. The intent of Policy No. 17 is to provide a more detailed timeline for completion of the annual audits, a requirement for suspending *TransNet* payments in cases where the fiscal audits are not completed in a timely manner, and additional details related to various adjustments to be made based on the annual audit findings.

Councilmember Madaffer expressed his desire that this information be out in the open.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel, stated that if we have a situation where a proposed policy deals with a discretionary issue, we would take it to the ITOC and other related committees. The proposed changes are only complying with requirements in the Ordinance.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the proposed amendments to the *TransNet* policies.

### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

9. Chair Kellejian indicated that there are several pieces of correspondence that were included in the agenda package. One was a memo notifying the Committee that Oceanside Mayor Jim Wood has been appointed to serve as the North County Coastal alternate representative to this Committee, effective immediately. The second piece was a letter responding to a group of people expressing interest in extending the trolley along the I-15 corridor between Escondido and San Diego. Chair Kellejian said that his response to that letter included information about the BRT system planned for this corridor. The third item was a memo to Transportation Committee members responding to questions raised concerning attendance by alternates at our Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings. Our adopted SANDAG policy encourages members and alternates to attend all Committee meetings. Attendance by Committee alternates, although not required, is encouraged. He noted that the Transportation Committee does not have any attendance problems.

### **REPORTS (10 THROUGH 13)**

10. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED CHANGE TO MTS RURAL TRANSIT ROUTE FARES AND APPROVAL OF CORRESPONDING CHANGE TO MTS FARE ORDINANCE (APPROVE)

Dan Levy, SANDAG Senior Transit Planner, introduced Brandon Farley, MTS Senior Transportation Planner.

Mr. Levy provided background information for this effort: MTS is seeking to make the entire system financially sustainable; the average subsidy per passenger trip on all MTS bus routes is \$2.04, but on the rural routes the average subsidy is \$22.43, with the highest

subsidy at over \$60.00 per one-way trip; and MTS approved rural service adjustments and wants to increase fares to achieve a 10 percent cost recovery rate for these rural services.

Mr. Levy showed a graph containing ridership and subsidy levels for the rural services. He indicated that the fare policy is SANDAG's responsibility and even though a regional fare ordinance has not yet been approved, Policy No. 29 requires SANDAG's approval for all fare changes. Mr. Levy reviewed recent MTS Board actions regarding this proposal. Following SANDAG approval of the fare adjustments, MTS will amend its existing fare ordinance, and the proposed adjustments would be incorporated into the SANDAG regional fare ordinance in the future.

Chair Kellejian clarified that this meeting is only related to the fare adjustments; MTS has already had a public hearing and several meetings with the communities on the route changes.

Councilmember Emery stated that the most telling figures are the subsidies that these rural routes require, one of which is \$127 for a round trip. Only the Tecate to Alpine route is close to the systemwide cost recovery figures. The goal is to get to the 10 percent farebox recovery rate.

Councilmember Madaffer asked how many passengers are on the Route 889 on a daily basis. Mr. Jablonski replied that the average passenger per trip rate is 1.2 for that route.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) wondered if it is our public responsibility to provide this transportation. Having a high subsidy caused the demise of the dial-a-ride services.

Chair Kellejian commented that this issue is the reason for the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA); to change the culture and how business is conducted at MTS. NCTD went through a similar process to match service levels with ridership. Included in the COA is a process for dealing with services that do not meet the farebox recovery ratio.

Toni Bates, Division Director of Transit Planning, commented that MTS is proposing a policy that these rural routes achieve a minimum 10 percent farebox recovery within a six-month period or be reevaluated.

Mayor Pro Tem Ed Gallo (NCTD) stated that there comes a point of diminishing return and then you are out of business.

Ms. Bates noted that the combination of service adjustments and this proposed fare increase would save MTS about \$1 million a year in subsidy costs.

Mr. Jablonski said that there was a lot of discussion throughout this process for maintaining a lifeline level of service, which cannot always be achieved by complying with a strict farebox recovery. That is why the MTS Board voted to bring those services that do not meet the six-month 10 percent farebox recovery requirement back to them for reevaluation.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) said that the 10 percent farebox recovery rate was a goal that was less than the average of 36 percent for the balance of the system.

Provision of service in areas with this subsidy rate is being balanced by the MTS Board with the need to provide service in areas having high density but no transit service.

Chair Kellejian opened the public hearing at 9:34 a.m. He pointed out that committee members had at their seats copies of input from callers, e-mails, and letters received.

Public Comments:

Crane Johnson, a member of the public, and a resident of Jacumba said that “beating louder and louder is the death rattle of the rural bus system.”

Gary Thyberg, a member of the public, said that the economic class of people that ride the Route 888 bus cannot afford a \$10 fare. The zones for this route are entirely disproportionate to costs and distance traveled. The mileage from Jacumba to Alpine is 107 or two-man hours, which is what the contract is based on. Only half the fare is charged for that distance. Alpine to the El Cajon Transit Center is 14.5 miles, and half the fare is charged for that distance. With only half fare going to 80 percent of costs, this route is designed for failure as it cannot possibly meet the 10 percent minimum. The zone for Route 894 is from Campo to Tecate, which is about 20 miles. It serves three communities that are unfairly charged for a 20-mile trip: Cameron Corners, Campo, and Portrero. They are charged \$5 to travel 20 miles and another \$5 to go from Tecate to El Cajon. It’s hard to understand why only three communities have to pay a \$10 fare when they are only 20 miles from the zone. He thought that Route 894 doesn’t need to be in a zone because the great majority of the passenger load is from Tecate.

Julie Ritzo, a member of the public, said that she just drove down from Warner Springs. The rural bus has been discontinued there as of September 6 and many members of the community signed a petition for this rural bus to be reinstated to Warner Springs. She said that many people depend on that service. She asked about the process for reinstating that service.

Chair Kellejian said that the route changes were decided by the MTS Board.

Ms. Wiley assured Ms. Ritzo that the petition documents will get to MTS staff.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Emery, the public hearing was closed.

Board Member Comments:

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) said that MTS has been working on the COA for several months now. The goal for the COA is to create a financially sustainable system. The three major goals of the COA are to create a network of transit services in the urban area, create commuter services to serve employment areas, and create some local special services, like the Super Shuttle. What is not on that list is lifeline service and rural service. Some areas will lose bus service as a result of COA implementation. We need to be clear about where we are headed and what has been endorsed in the COA.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Inland) said that perhaps one solution is for these cities to develop a program similar to Vista's "Out and About Program," and/or operate buses only on certain days of the week. Councilmember Monroe responded that some of the rural routes are already only operating a couple days a week.

Chair Kellejian noted that included in the agenda report is a map and days of service for the rural routes.

Mayor Madrid said that it seems to him there is a philosophy that transportation is urban only, but then we are expected to implement services that support other views or guidelines that relate to sprawl. He thought we should not provide other services.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, noted that that is precisely what you are doing with linking transportation and land use. The Smart Growth Concept Map will define locations for growth and for transportation service. This Map is a tool to help policymakers develop more growth.

Councilmember Emery mentioned that none of the members of the MTS Board have seen the COA report. He expressed concern that conclusions about the COA were being stated without full MTS Board approval.

Mayor Madrid asked about the size of the buses used for these rural services.

Mr. Emery asked for a response on what kind of buses are operated on the rural services. Mr. Farley answered that there are two different sized buses operating on these services: a 30-foot, 22 passenger bus, or a van-type model with a 15-passenger capacity.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Dale and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee voted to approve fare adjustments of up to \$10 for one-way fares for MTS Rural Bus services, with zones and discounts as identified in Table 2 of the report.

11. 2006 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES (APPROVE)

Jose Nuncio, Senior Engineer/Programming Manager, explained that the STIP is a five-year transportation funding program typically used for capacity-increasing projects, operational projects, and funding for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) across the state. It is renewed every two years, with two new years of programming capacity added in the process. The last time the STIP was adopted was in 2004.

Mr. Nuncio provided a status of the 2004 STIP remaining years. About \$33.6 million has been programmed and half of these funds have been allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The 2004 STIP remaining program is distributed to various projects, primarily State Route (SR) 52. The CTC takes regional STIP funds off-the-top for previous commitments, including the payback for GARVEE bonds that were approved for the I-15 Managed Lanes and the Assembly Bill (AB) 3090 reimbursement payments that the CTC is

scheduled to allocate in FY 2006/07 and 2007/08. These funds, totaling \$55.4 million during the remaining years of the 2004 STIP, are not available for reprogramming to any other project, and they reduce the region's programming capacity for other projects. There is about \$4 million in FY 2005/2006 rollover funds for projects where the allocation is not anticipated.

The changes from the 2004 STIP to the 2006 STIP indicate that: there is no increase in programming capacity for major projects, there is an increase of \$6.3 million in Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, the off-the-top commitments continue to 2011, and there is an opportunity to make adjustments and reprogramming on previously programmed projects.

Mr. Nuncio explained the 2004 STIP programmed funding vs. the 2006 STIP targets. Most of the money is programmed in FY 2007-2009; however, the 2006 STIP targets show the availability of funds in FY 2009-2011; therefore, if the region followed the 2006 STIP targets, we would need to push out projects two years. The CTC has expressed a willingness to advance projects to 2007 and 2008 from 2009 due to major projects that may or may not be ready in other regions for award to construction. There is also an opportunity of potential adjustments to the 2004 STIP that would free up a total of \$23.5 million for other projects.

Mr. Nuncio reviewed the 2006 STIP proposed criteria: complete existing STIP projects and focus on the *TransNet* Early Action Projects, program projects as early as possible, maintain existing program levels, and adjust programming to account for funding by other sources.

The 2006 STIP potential options include the SR 52 extension from SR 125 to SR 67, the Mid-Coast Trolley Extension, SANDAG Planning and Program Monitoring, SR 905, programs other than non-STIP projects, and transportation enhancement funds (augment Pilot Smart Growth Incentives Program funding and identify other TE-eligible projects).

Mr. Nuncio indicated that the RTIP needs to be submitted to the CTC by January 30, 2006, and will be adopted by the CTC at its April 27, 2006, meeting.

Chair Kellejian reiterated the recommended actions, which are to approve the list of criteria for the 2006 STIP, place emphasis on the four options stated above, and approve the allocation of the TE programs.

Councilmember Emery said that the \$23.5 million could also be used for capital improvement projects for the transit operators. We need to continue to look for funding for unfunded capital improvement projects.

Councilmember Rindone agreed that those projects for MTS and NTCD could meet the funding criteria. He didn't want to underutilize those funds.

Mayor Mickey Cafagna (North County Inland) stated that if we use these funds for capital improvement projects for the transit operators, then there will be funding shortfalls in the Early Action Projects. He asked how these shortfalls will be made up. Mr. Gallegos said that you would have to take funds from other sources. He said that if you are going to do that for the transit operators, you should also do that for all 18 cities. The \$23 million is not

going to get us far. The priorities in the past have been to complete those projects already in the STIP.

Councilmember Dale said that it is important that we honor our commitment to high-priority projects. If this \$23.5 million will help those projects, then that is our applied commitment.

Mayor Madrid commented that a reason for not supporting the extension of *TransNet* was that commitments from the earlier program were not met. He supported funding priority commitments.

Mayor Madrid expressed his support for the rideshare program and said it is a viable program to address the congestion issue.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the Rideshare program was shifted out of STIP because we are funding that program with federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) dollars. The CTC has made rideshare funds a low priority and our expectation is that if you leave it in the STIP, it will get deferred to the back years of the STIP.

Councilmember Monroe noted that the agenda report states that the CTC is asking regions to add transit capital projects to their priority STIP lists because it believes funding will be available for transit-specific projects. He asked if there is a bias at the state level for transit projects. Mr. Gallegos stated that that is a true statement for money that CTC expects for new projects (not already allocated ones). San Diego County is not getting new dollars because we already spent some of our money. We are talking about reshifting our STIP dollars.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks (NCTD) reiterated the transit operators' needs for large infrastructure repair and maintenance. NCTD and MTS have a lot of aging hardware. He said that the policy direction and philosophy is very clear.

Councilmember Madaffer agreed that we should stick to the commitment made to the voters. He asked about funding for the Nobel Drive Coaster Station project. Mr. Gallegos said that those funds would come from several places: developer money, the STIP, state or federal pass-through dollars (CMAQ, Regional Surface Transportation Program [RSTP]), and *TransNet*.

Councilmember Madaffer asked that staff report back to show where capital improvement projects can get slotted for funding. Mr. Gallegos acknowledged the capital needs raised by both transit agencies and said that the amount of available funds will not meet those needs. The best opportunity to meet those needs is with new dollars. Unfortunately, we are not getting new dollars in this STIP cycle. The policy in the past has been to complete the projects already started.

Supervisor Roberts said that we need to make sure we follow-through on what we promised not only in the recent *TransNet* vote but in the earlier vote as well.

In response to a question from Chair Kellejian, Mr. Gallegos responded that staff is suggesting we not apply for money for SR 905 at this point because there is a more viable federal funding source for that project.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (East County), the Transportation Committee approved the 2006 STIP development criteria and approved the 2004 STIP potential program adjustments contained in the agenda report.

12. MAGLEV STUDY SCOPE OF WORK (APPROVE)

Ms. Leslie Blanda, Project Development Program Manager, reported that the federal multi-year transportation bill (SAFETEA-LU) included an \$800,000 earmark to study the feasibility of a Magnetic Levitation (Maglev) link between San Diego and a potential regional airport site in the Imperial Valley. When matched with local funds, \$1 million will be available over four years for the study. She reviewed previous actions taken by the Transportation Committee on this subject.

Ms. Blanda stated that staff worked to develop a two-phased scope of work to study the feasibility of Maglev. Phase 1 would study east/west alignments, and Phase 2 would study north/south alignments. Phase 1 would generally follow the Interstate 8 (I-8) corridor from the San Diego International Airport to the potential regional airport site, known as the Desert Site, in Imperial County. The alignments studied in Phase 2 would link San Diego and Imperial Counties to the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) potential Maglev network to the north. Phase 2 would also study the I-405 corridor in Orange County as a potential link to the Long Beach Airport. Both the east/west and north/south alignments are potentially critical segments of a larger Maglev network connecting San Diego County, Imperial County, and the potential SCAG Maglev network to the north. The potential to utilize Maglev technology for freight as well as passenger service would be investigated through the study.

Ms. Blanda presented the scope of work highlights, the schedule, and the Phase 1 estimated budget. She indicated that this study could have an impact on a decision to be made by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) on a new airport location. It is critical to conclude the Phase 1 study by February 2006 so that the results of the study can be shared with the Airport Authority in early March. She also reviewed the study organization. She noted that Congressman Bob Filner has expressed his willingness to support federal legislation to allow federal earmark funds remaining from Phase 1 to be used for Phase 2. The receipt of \$600,000 to conduct Phase 2 is contingent on amending the current federal legislation and securing the local matching funds. The Phase 1 scope of work will provide a comparative analysis of Maglev, dedicated highway lanes, and high-speed rail.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we have met with Imperial County representatives, and one important piece is that Imperial County has an approved project through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to study a major freight hub there. He said that linking San Diego with other markets east of here for freight has merit.

Mayor Cafagna asked if we are going to be evaluating the environmental impacts on both phases of the project. Ms. Blanda responded affirmatively.

Sandy Shapery (Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group) said that the scope of Phase 2 is of particular interest to the Port of San Diego. If we can have a system running from the Mexican border to the Colton rail line, the freight portion could be a financially significant component. He hoped the scope could include that review.

Chair Kellejian said he would accept funding from the Port for that purpose. He asked staff to contact the Port for a possible financial contribution to the Phase 2 study.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if we will be able to study the north/south route. Mr. Gallegos responded that we will be looking at three north/south alignments.

Councilmember Madaffer inquired about the timing of this work. Mr. Gallegos replied that it would be 12 to 18 months after receiving the authority to spend the money. He said that Congressman Filner thinks the first opportunity to amend the federal legislation would be in the November 2005 time frame.

Mayor Madrid noted that there is no indication of the Airport Authority contributing money for this project. He thought that the Authority should be providing some funding for this study. Mayor Sessom stated that the Airport Authority is also studying some alignments on a parallel path, and both the Airport Authority and SANDAG staffs have been collaborating. The Airport Authority will share its data with SANDAG staff, which will bring down the cost of SANDAG's study.

Mayor Madrid asked that jurisdictions along the proposed alignments be accorded an opportunity to provide input.

Chair Kellejian said that we should include in the motion direction to staff to obtain the participation and financial support of the Airport Authority and the Port of San Diego on this project and to extend the study area to the land port at the Mexican border.

Mayor Cafagna stated that he didn't want redundancy with the work done by SANDAG and the Airport Authority.

Councilmember Dale noted that page 13 of the agenda report indicates a new north-south freeway corridor. He wondered where that corridor would be. Mr. Gallegos said that that will be a challenge to delineate. He noted that only existing rights-of-ways will prove to be feasible for such an alignment.

Councilmember Dale asked if such an alignment would fit into SR 67. Mr. Gallegos replied that a large portion of that route goes north-south until Mt. Woodsen, where it turns east. We would include that alignment in the study.

Mayor Madrid suggested that all geographic locations be looked at for the north-south project.

Mr. Shapery stated that an interconnected Maglev system can be used as a conduit for other things like energy, and other utilities can be incorporated into the guideway.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee directed staff: (1) to proceed with a scope of work for the Phase 1 (East/West Alignment) Maglev study, in an amount not to exceed \$400,000; and (2) to work with Congressman Bob Filner to amend the current federal legislation to allow use of the remaining \$480,000 federal Maglev study funds to conduct a Phase 2 (North/South Alignment) Maglev study in San Diego and Imperial Counties linking to the SCAG potential Maglev network to the north; and, contingent upon amending the current federal legislation: (3) recommend that the Executive Committee approve the use of up to \$120,000 from SANDAG's contingency reserve to match the earmark funds for the Phase 2 (North/South Alignment) study; (4) recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors amend the FY 2006 Overall Work Program (OWP) and the Program Budget to add a work element of up to \$600,000 for the Phase 2 (North/South Alignment) study and approve the processing of any necessary amendments to SANDAG's Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); (5) authorize staff to proceed with the scope of work for Phase 2 (North/South Alignment) of the Maglev study, in an amount not to exceed \$600,000; (6) direct staff to work with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority and Port of San Diego to obtain their participation and financial support for the Phase 2 study; extended the study area to the ports of entry at the United States-Mexican border; and (7) direct staff to work with local jurisdictions to obtain input regarding environmental and aesthetic impacts of Maglev through their jurisdictions.

13. MID-CITY TRANSIT NETWORK PLAN AND SHOWCASE BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT STATUS (APPROVE)

Miriam Kirshner, Senior Transit Planner, reported that in 2002, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board selected a corridor from San Diego State University (SDSU) to downtown San Diego as a "Showcase" project for implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). In working with the community to develop this concept, there was a lot of support for most of the improvements such as signal priority and station and signal elements, but not for dedicated transit lanes. There had also been a request from the community to develop a transit network plan to show how all of the transit services in the area would work together. Therefore, staff undertook the development of a network plan. The goals of the plan were to develop a long-term transit network plan for the Mid-City communities, prioritize transit improvements, and develop a phasing plan to conform to alternative budget scenarios. Ms. Kirshner reviewed the study process and showed the network plan study area. She indicated that the key issues of the public advisory committee were better connections to job centers to the north (particularly along the I-15 corridor), improved circulation within Mid-City, and increased investment in facilities and services. She stated that this work was coordinated with the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR).

Ms. Kirshner reviewed key issues in four areas: regional, corridor, local, and neighborhood services. The study recommendations for regional services was a focus on transfer connections to the trolley in Mission Valley and to future freeway BRT services at the Mid-City Transit Plazas at El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue along I-15; for corridor services, the focus was on improved speed and reliability; for local services, it was a focus on

improved connections and service frequencies; and for neighborhood services, it was to fill in the service gaps.

Ms. Kirshner reviewed the advisory committee priority rankings: "Rapid Bus" on El Cajon Boulevard, increased frequencies on north-south routes, a City Heights shuttle, regional connections, and the last priority was full BRT (with dedicated lanes) on El Cajon Boulevard. As a result, the recommendation is to redefine the service from BRT to Rapid Bus to include elements we have always planned (signal priority, upgraded stations, queue jumps, and branded vehicles) and to implement these elements in phases as funding becomes available.

Ms. Kirshner reviewed the next steps to finalize the Mid-City Transit Network Plan: pursue the Rapid Bus concepts for El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, evaluate proposed service changes with MTS as part of the COA, and pursue I-15 Mid-City Transit Plaza stations with the I-15 Early Action BRT Project.

Councilmember Emery complimented staff on a very good report, but expressed his disappointment to see the recommendation to scale back the BRT to Rapid Bus. However, he fully understood the hesitation of businesses along El Cajon Boulevard for a dedicated transitway required for BRT. He wondered where this fits within the overall COA. He was concerned about making a decision without seeing the big picture.

Chair Kellejian noted that there were two requests to speak.

Jay Powell, representing the City Heights Community Development Corporation, stated that they have been involved in the I-15 and SR 15 corridor issues for decades. He spoke in support of the staff recommendation with a special emphasis on the advancement of the Rapid Bus transit system. He said that it is very important to have express lines that tie this all together. These actions will lead us in the direction of a dedicated transit lane. One issue related to the I-15 BRT is that I-15 was redesigned to provide wider bridges to accommodate dedicated transit lanes for a trolley or BRT service. A study is underway about the use of those lanes. Those stations will need to have the dedication in order to function as platforms.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, expressed concerns about redefining the Showcase BRT Project to Rapid Bus. This is a different concept than what was originally portrayed to the public. He understood the opposition to the dedicated transit lanes. He asked if the shift from BRT to Rapid Bus will involve the same level of funding. If there is money to be pulled out of the Showcase project, where would it go? He hoped that it would be used for additional transit service and to offset transit operating costs.

Chair Kellejian noted that this report is going out for public review. He asked if the report back will respond to the question on funding. Ms. Bates said that there were two actions being recommended: release the Network Plan for public review and comment, and redefine the El Cajon Boulevard BRT to a Rapid Bus. She noted that by redefining BRT to Rapid Bus there is an opportunity to phase in and perhaps ultimately end up with a BRT. Los Angeles has been very successful with a Rapid Bus program on Wilshire and Ventura Boulevards that do not have dedicated lanes but a lot of other features of rapid

transit. That is the model we are trying to emulate. Staff will come back with the definition of Rapid Bus and the costs of the components, and the Transportation Committee will determine which ones will be implemented. The Showcase Project is in the *TransNet Extension* but is not an Early Action Project.

Councilmember Monroe expressed support for recommendations 2 and 3 but was confused with the recommendation to release the Network Plan for public review and comment in light of the COA work. Ms. Bates said that MTS staff has been on the committee to develop the Network Plan and that the plan has been developed with assistance from the same consultant that is conducting the COA. Consistency is there because it is a partnership with MTS.

Mr. Jablonski said that he was comfortable with the plan as it fits in with the COA. The premise for doing BRT along an urban corridor was a sound one. But the fact that we are going to a limited-stop Rapid Bus service is disappointing. To the extent we can implement enhancements, that is a positive step, but for an urban BRT system, it's a big step backwards.

Mayor Madrid expressed disappointment with this recommendation. He said this is a defining moment for this organization to either do something that has vision and integrity and will be a solution, or perpetuate the history of this region. He understood that having a dedicated lane for transit is not a popular one. We should adopt a policy that has a strong vision.

Mr. Gallegos said that in order to make BRT work, we have to either eliminate parking or a city street traffic lane, and there is no community support for that action. The Transportation Committee does not have the authority to do that. We have to work through the City of San Diego to make that happen. What we are advocating is to work with that community to build to a BRT.

Ms. Bates said that the Rapid Bus concept has a lot of features of BRT. We can create what we are looking for in better bus service as a first step.

Mayor Madrid suggested that rather than making bold recommendations, staff should come forward with a series of steps leading up to the ultimate goal.

Mayor Cafagna commented that he is not ready to give up on BRT in that area, but this is a good first step. He asked if a study had been conducted to find a parallel street to El Cajon Boulevard. Ms. Bates said that staff looked at it initially, but other streets do not go the full length of El Cajon Boulevard. Mr. Gallegos added that alternate streets get into the residential community.

Councilmember Rindone said that he could not support the recommendation to redefine the BRT to a Rapid Bus project. He suggested that it be tabled, have a discussion and joint meeting with the San Diego City Council, and discuss it as partners. There are times when we have to do business differently. We need a full commitment from the City of San Diego on this issue. This is an opportunity that we cannot afford to waste. We also don't know what we are voting on today with regard to the definition, the amount of money, and the options.

### Motion Made

Councilmember Rindone offered an alternative motion to table this item, begin discussions with the City of San Diego, and bring this item back in early 2006 to move forward with BRT. Councilmember Emery seconded this motion.

Councilmember Madaffer shared Councilmember Rindone's frustration with regard to BRT. However, this is the first step in a phased strategy approach. He didn't know if the change in leadership in the Mayor's office will make a difference because they work on a district approach. He has worked with Councilmember Toni Atkins on this matter.

Councilmember Madaffer asked Mr. Powell to share the concerns about this change from BRT to Rapid Bus with the community. Mr. Powell stated that members of the business community and neighborhood associations were not prepared to support giving up parking or giving up space for a dedicated transit lane. The other factor was the prioritization of the north-south BRT on I-15 to progress first to be the hub of any Mid-City system. The process in terms of working with the community to prioritize the Mid-City network was a good process with a phased approach. He felt that the Rapid Bus will evolve into BRT.

Councilmember Madaffer wondered if a caveat could be added that this would be designed as a Rapid Bus project but make it clear that it will go into a dedicated lane project within five to ten years. Mr. Powell deferred to staff on that question. It was his sense from being on the advisory committee that the community wants to see no adverse impact to their interests. He personally felt that a Rapid Bus project will improve the economy of that community.

Ms. Kirshner stated that there were some members of the advisory committee against a dedicated transit lane. Since the BRT was not a *TransNet* Early Action Project, the focus of the advisory committee was to improve service incrementally, and there wasn't a resolution about whether in some future time they would accommodate dedicated transit lanes.

Ms. Bates said that staff will report on what features would be included in the Rapid Bus service in terms of a longer vision so that we don't lose sight of BRT, and ask our Independent Transit Planning peer review committee to look at this issue. The peer review committee is looking at the hierarchy of investment in transit corridors that may help guide us.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the region is making an incredible investment in this area. He suggested that a better motion would be to accept the report and put a timeline on turning the Rapid Bus into a dedicated lane facility. That would give the opportunity for dialogue with the community and recognize that SANDAG means business.

Councilmember Rindone said that the reality is you have to take first steps before you get to the BRT. It is premature for the Transportation Committee to make that judgment to delineate it as BRT. The substitute motion would allow dialogue to continue but not eliminate that phased vision. If we do that prematurely, then we are not as responsible as

we need to be. Once we do the initial steps, have that dialogue, and the partnership with the full San Diego City council, it will be a convincing effort.

Councilmember Rindone said the motion is to return to this item when we have the additional information.

Councilmember Madaffer offered a substitute motion that we adopt staff recommendations 1, 2, and 3 and add a fourth item that we ask staff to go back out to the community and to work on a timeline to implement what would become the BRT as originally envisioned. He would like to have the community recognize the fact that it sounds like this Committee will eventually impose BRT even if the community is not ready to accept it.

### Substitute Motion

Councilmember Madaffer moved to adopt staff recommendations 1, 2, and 3, and to add a fourth recommendation to direct staff to work with the community and develop a timeline for implementing what would ultimately be BRT. Mayor Cafagna seconded this motion.

Councilmember Rindone said that the fourth recommendation is incongruent with the second recommendation, and he asked staff to explain how that would work.

Councilmember Madaffer suggested that he add "approve redefining the BRT project as an interim phase."

Leon Williams, MTS Chair, agreed with Mayor Madrid's comments because they reflected leadership. He said that someone has to stand for something that makes sense and to convince others who may not understand that the vision is valuable to them in the long term. Before a recommendation is made it should come back as if it is going to be policy. We have to take the step to prove the benefit of what we are trying to do.

Councilmember Stocks spoke on behalf of the small, independent businesses along El Cajon Boulevard who are concerned about their customers not being able to park near or in front of their stores. This is vitality important to small businesses. We can talk about the benefit of mass transit; however, the majority of people do not take mass transit. Taking away parking will be a major issue. The staff recommendation makes sense.

Mayor Cafagna said that the vision of BRT is not being killed today. It's happening; we are doing it on I-15, we will have a showcase for BRT. He said there will be BRT on El Cajon Boulevard one day, but this is the type of project we can do now. The BRT is not funded yet, and we should move ahead under Councilmember Madaffer's new motion.

Councilmember Monroe said we picked the wrong Showcase project. We started with 13 Showcase project candidates and narrowed it down to 5. There was tremendous competition among those five candidates. He wondered if we should go back and look at candidate projects 2, 3, 4, and 5. We've lost the leadership that would have made this happen on this route. He strongly recommended support for Councilmember Rindone's substitute motion.

Councilmember Madaffer thanked staff members Bob Leiter and Miriam Kirshner for all of their hard work on this. He asked Mr. Powell to convey the Committee's direction to the Mid-City community that they need to look at this going to a permanent route within the next three years.

Mr. Williams asked if the parking issue can be included when staff reports back.

Mayor Madrid agreed with Councilmember Monroe that we should go back and review the other highly ranked Showcase candidate projects. He thought the authority and integrity of this body is being challenged.

Ms. Bates said staff will report back on what the other Showcase candidate projects were and noted that we have a Caltrans grant for the second-ranked Showcase project, which was a north-south alignment between downtown San Diego through Hillcrest to Mission Valley.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the Transportation Committee approved: (1) the release of the draft Mid-City Transit Network Plan and authorized its distribution for review and comment by community and business groups for 60 days; (2) redefining the Showcase BRT project to a Rapid Bus as an interim phase, with details on the specific service attributes to be determined following completion of the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) and the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA); (3) amending the FY 2006 OWP project listing for the Showcase BRT Project to reflect the redefinition of the project as a Rapid Bus service as outlined in the agenda report, and (4) direction to staff to work with the community and develop a timeline for implementing what would ultimately be BRT. The vote in favor was: Councilmember Stocks (NCTD), Mayor Cafagna (North County Inland), Councilmember Madaffer (City of San Diego), Chair Kellejian (North County Coastal), and Councilmember Dale (East County). Councilmember Emery (MTS) and Councilmember Rindone (South County) voted in opposition. The motion carried.

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, November 4, 2005, and Friday, December 9, 2005.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
OCTOBER 21, 2005**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Oceanside	Jim Wood	Alternate	No	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	Yes	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	Yes	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	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	No	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes	
	MTS	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit District	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	See above
	City of Escondido	Ed Gallo	Alternate	Yes	
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	

10/28/2005 11:48 AM