

## Members

Shirley Horton, Chair  
(Representing South Bay)  
Mayor, **Chula Vista**

Joe Kellejian, Vice Chair  
(Representing North County Coastal)  
Councilmember, **Solana Beach**

Mickey Cafagna  
(Representing North County Inland)  
Mayor, **Poway**

Art Madrid  
(Representing East County)  
Mayor, **La Mesa**

Dick Murphy  
Mayor, **City of San Diego**

Ron Roberts  
Chair, Board of Supervisors  
**County of San Diego**

## Alternates

Ron Morrison  
(Representing South Bay)  
Councilmember, **National City**

Ramona Finnilla  
(Representing North County Coastal)  
Councilmember, **Carlsbad**

Hal Martin  
(Representing North County Inland)  
Councilmember, **San Marcos**

Jack Dale  
(Representing East County)  
Councilmember, **Santee**

Brian Maienschein  
Councilmember, **City of San Diego**

Bill Horn  
Supervisor, **County of San Diego**

## Advisory Members

Leon Williams, Chair  
**Metropolitan Transit  
Development Board**

Bob Emery, Alternate  
**Metropolitan Transit  
Development Board**

Julianne Nygaard, Chair  
**North San Diego County  
Transit Development Board**

Pedro Orso-Delgado  
District Director, District 11  
**California Department of  
Transportation**

Tom Larwin, General Manager  
**Metropolitan Transit  
Development Board**

Karen King, Interim Executive Director  
**North San Diego County  
Transit Development Board**

Gary L. Gallegos  
Executive Director, **SANDAG**



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Thursday, September 12, 2002  
12:15 p.m.

**SANDAG Board Room  
401 B Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101-4231**

## AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
- DRAFT 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – PROPOSED REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN

**PLEASE TURN OFF  
CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING**

## MISSION STATEMENT

*The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.*

San Diego Association of Governments • 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231  
(619) 595-5300 • Fax (619) 595-5305 • www.sandag.org



Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at [www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org) under meetings on SANDAG's Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon on the Tuesday preceding the Thursday Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300 or fax (619) 595-5305.

**SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.**  
**Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see [www.sdcommute.com](http://www.sdcommute.com) for route information.**



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Thursday, September 12, 2002

Staff contact: Kim Kawada (619) 595-5394 or kka@sandag.org

**ITEM #** **RECOMMENDATION**

## CONSENT ITEMS (1 through 3)

*The Transportation Committee will take action on the consent agenda without further discussion and with one vote unless an item is pulled by a Committee member or by a member of the public for comment.*

**+1. REGIONAL ARTERIAL SYSTEM – FUND REALLOCATION AND EXCHANGE (José Nuncio)** **RECOMMEND**

In July and August 2002, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) discussed proposals to reallocate and exchange regional funding to expedite delivery of Regional Arterial System projects. CTAC recommends: (1) returning \$5.968 million of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from the construction phase of National City's Plaza Boulevard project to the SANDAG reserve in accordance with SANDAG's Use-it-or-Lose-it Policy; (2) using \$3.463 million of the reserve to fund "ready to go" projects; and (3) exchanging RSTP, 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and *TransNet* funding among five projects in the Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos. Approval of CTAC's recommendations would expedite delivery of the City of San Diego's Genesee Avenue and Carroll Canyon Road and the City of San Marcos' Rancho Santa Fe Road widening projects, without affecting schedules for the other projects. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend amending the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to incorporate the fund reallocation and exchange.

**+ 2. SAN DIEGO & ARIZONA EASTERN RAILWAY UPDATE (Mike Hix)** **INFORMATION**

This report provides an update on the San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway, which straddles the U.S./Mexico border, connecting San Diego, Tijuana, Tecate, and the Imperial Valley. The U.S. section of the railroad is owned by the MTDB, and the 44 miles in Mexico are owned by the State of Baja California. The rail line has been closed east of Tecate since 1983.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

(Speakers limited to three minutes each.)

**ITEM #**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**REPORTS**

- + 4. REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (Richard Chavez) RECOMMEND**

The SANDAG Board has supported defining a Regionally Significant Transportation Network as part of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In August 2002, the Transportation Committee reviewed recommendations for the Network’s highway corridor and regional transit service components. The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) discussed criteria for the Network’s regional arterial component in July 2002 and reviewed arterial network options at its August 22, 2002 meeting. Different arterial options recommended by CTAC and SANDAG staff are provided for Transportation Committee review. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend incorporating the Regionally Significant Transportation Network in the Draft 2030 RTP.

- + 5. DRAFT 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) – PROPOSED REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN (Kim Kawada) REVIEW AND COMMENT**

The preliminary draft 2030 RTP, Mobility 2030, was released on August 2, 2002, and is based on a \$41.3 billion Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. In accordance with federal regulations, the draft 2030 RTP also must include a Revenue Constrained plan, which is driven by a tighter budget and more conservative financial assumptions (\$29.9 billion in revenue). At its August 27, 2002 meeting, the 2030 RTP Working Group reviewed and discussed the Revenue Constrained plan. The Transportation Committee is asked to review and comment on the proposed Revenue Constrained plan. The Committee’s comments will be incorporated into the Draft 2030 RTP, which is scheduled for release in October 2002.

- + 6. I-5/GENESSEE AVENUE/SORRENTO VALLEY ROAD INTERCHANGES PROJECT - STUDY REPORT UPDATE (Dean Hiatt) INFORMATION**

Staff will provide an update on the I-5/Genessee Avenue/Sorrento Valley Road Interchanges Project Study Report (PSR). The PSR is evaluating interchange, arterial, and system management improvements in the study area.

THE NEXT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING IS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2002.

This agenda is sent to all members of the SANDAG/RTC Board of Directors and alternates for informational purposes.

The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 12, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## REGIONAL ARTERIAL SYSTEM – FUND REALLOCATION AND EXCHANGE

### **Introduction**

In accordance with the Regional Arterial System Use-it-or-Lose-it policy, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) reviews the schedules of various Regional Arterial System projects and evaluates their compliance with the policy. The policy mandates CTAC to make a recommendation on a schedule extension or fund reallocation when a project's schedule slips 12 months or longer. In addition, the policy states that schedule extensions are not to be recommended if the funds cannot be obligated within the funding cycle in which they were originally programmed. This report includes a recommendation on a fund reallocation for the construction funds of the Plaza Boulevard Widening project in the City of National City to a Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) reserve.

In addition, there is an opportunity to expedite delivery of three Regional Arterial System projects, including the City of San Marcos' Rancho Santa Fe Road and the City of San Diego's Genesee Avenue and Carroll Canyon projects. These projects, which are currently being processed for federal environmental clearance, already have or nearly have CEQA clearance. The Cities of Carlsbad and Chula Vista have expressed a willingness to exchange local funding on their Rancho Santa Fe Road and Olympic Parkway projects, respectively, for federal RSTP funding in order to assist the Cities of San Marcos and San Diego in expediting project delivery. The exchange also includes \$3.463 million from the RSTP reserve to address additional funding shortfalls resulting from the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) revised 2002 STIP procedures. It is estimated that this fund transfer will expedite project delivery by a total of three years without causing delay to the projects that are providing the local funds as part of the exchange. This report also includes a recommendation on this fund transfer.

### **Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the fund reallocation from the Plaza Boulevard Widening project in National City to an RSTP reserve; allocate funds from the reserve to the City of San Diego's Genesee Avenue and City of San Marcos' Rancho Santa Fe Road projects, and approve a fund exchange between the Cities of San Diego and San Marcos and the Cities of Carlsbad and Chula Vista.

### **Discussion**

#### *Fund Reallocation*

In 1998, SANDAG programmed \$800,000 for preliminary engineering, \$1,200,000 for right of way acquisition and \$5,968,000 for construction, totaling \$7,968,000, on the Plaza Boulevard Widening project in the City of National City. The original construction contract award milestone date was January 2004, but this date has now slipped to June 2005, a delay of 17 months. In addition, the

construction contract award milestone date would cause obligation of RSTP funds to occur nine months after the September 2004 end of the current RSTP funding cycle. Per the Regional Arterial System's Use-it-or-Lose-it policy, CTAC shall not recommend a schedule extension when the obligation of funds will occur beyond the end of the current RSTP funding cycle, as would be the case with this project.

CTAC evaluated the project's progress and recommends to the Transportation Committee that the project retain its preliminary engineering and right of way acquisition funding, which totals \$2,000,000, in order to allow work to continue. CTAC further recommends that the construction funds, which total \$5,968,000, be reallocated to a SANDAG RSTP reserve to be used for programming of other "ready to go" projects. It should be noted that this reallocation does not preclude National City from requesting that construction funds be programmed for the Plaza Boulevard project in the next SANDAG funding cycle during the future reauthorization of TEA-21 or the 2004 STIP cycle. At that time, this project would have a higher priority over other projects given its progress with the environmental process.

*Fund Transfer*

There is an opportunity to expedite delivery of three projects: San Marcos' Rancho Santa Fe Avenue and the City of San Diego's Genesee Avenue and Carroll Canyon projects. These three projects are in the initial stages of the federal environmental clearance process, but all have or nearly have CEQA clearance. A transfer of local funds from the Cities of Carlsbad and Chula Vista would allow these three projects to advance their delivery by an estimated three years. The Carlsbad and Chula Vista projects already have or nearly have their federal environmental clearance and would therefore not be delayed by exchanging their local funds for federal RSTP funds. Both the Cities of Carlsbad and Chula Vista concur with this exchange.

This exchange also would partially address the programming shortfall resulting from the CTC's revised 2002 STIP funding priorities which state that additional future year STIP advances will not be considered at this time. Both the Genesee Avenue project and San Marcos' Rancho Santa Fe Road project were part of the original list of Regional Arterial System projects to be funded with the \$35 million reserve of STIP funds. This exchange allows these "ready to go" projects to move forward without further delay.

The exchange is proposed to be on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the transfer of local funds to occur on a reimbursement basis. Provisions for the treatment of savings would insure that any unused RSTP funds are returned to the region and any unused local savings remain with the providing agency. Although the Cities of San Diego and San Marcos would not have federal RSTP funds in their respective projects, both cities have agreed to continue to adhere to the Regional Arterial System Use-it-or-Lose-it policy.

A total of \$3.463 million from the RSTP reserve created from approval of the National City Plaza Boulevard fund reallocation discussed above would contribute towards the exchange. A balance of \$2.505 million would remain in the RSTP reserve account to be used to address additional funding shortfalls resulting from the CTC's revised 2002 STIP procedures and the inability to access the \$35 million in future STIP funds at this time. A proposal to address the funding shortfall on the remaining Regional Arterial System projects that were to be funded with the \$35 million STIP funds will be prepared by staff and the affected cities and presented to the Transportation Committee in the near future. Details on the fund transfer and exchanges are provided in Attachment 1.

Regional Arterial System  
Fund Reallocation and Exchanges  
(\$ Thousands)

	SANDAG Reserve	National City Plaza Blvd	San Diego Genesee Ave			San Diego Carroll Canyon		Carlsbad Rancho Santa Fe Rd		San Marcos Rancho Santa Fe Rd			Chula Vista Olympic Pkwy	
	RSTP	RSTP	STIP	RSTP	Local	RSTP	Local	RSTP	Local	STIP	RSTP	TransNet	RSTP	TransNet
Beginning balance*	\$0	\$5,968	\$963	\$0	\$0	\$7,438	\$0	\$0	\$8,401	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500
(1) RSTP funds from National City to Reserve	\$5,968	(\$5,968)												
(2) Replace 2002 STIP funds with RSTP Reserve Funds	(\$3,463)		(\$963)	\$963						(\$2,500)	\$2,500			
(3) Carlsbad transfers local funds to San Diego; and					\$963	\$7,438		(\$8,401)						
(4) San Diego transfers RSTP funds to Carlsbad				(\$963)		(\$7,438)		\$8,401						
(5) Chula Vista transfers <i>TransNet</i> local funds to San Marcos; and												\$2,500	(\$2,500)	
(6) San Marcos transfers RSTP funds to Chula Vista											(\$2,500)		\$2,500	
Ending Balance	\$2,505	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$963	\$0	\$7,438	\$8,401	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$0

RSTP-Regional Surface Transportation Program (federal funds)

*TransNet*, local sales tax funds

STIP-State Transportation Improvement Program (state & federal funds). The STIP funds shown are not available for expenditure at this time.

\* Total programmed amounts may actually differ, amount shown is available for reallocation or exchange

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 12, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## SAN DIEGO & ARIZONA EASTERN RAILWAY UPDATE

### **Discussion**

The San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway connects San Diego to Tijuana, Tecate and the Imperial Valley (Attachment 1). The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) owns the portion of the line in the United States, while the State of Baja California owns the 44-mile portion in Mexico. East of Tecate the line has been closed since 1983, with freight service only available west of Tecate. In 2001, freight commodities included liquefied petroleum gas, lumber, beverages, paper, grain, and sand.

Freight service between San Diego and San Ysidro is provided by the San Diego and Imperial Valley (SDIV) Railroad. In May 2001, the State of Baja California awarded Carrizo Gorge Railway, in partnership with the Mexican company Ferrocarriles Peninsulares del Noroeste, a 25-year concession to operate freight on the Mexican section of the line. In May 2002, MTDB granted a contract to Carrizo Gorge Railway to repair, operate and maintain the 70-mile Desert Line. The Desert Line is the segment of the SD&AE in the U.S. east of Tecate, connecting to the Union Pacific Railroad in the Imperial Valley.

The Carrizo Gorge Railway is actively working toward reopening the Desert Line. Maintenance activities will soon increase, as insurance issues have now been resolved to allow heavy equipment on the line. East of Tecate, tracks have been cleared within seven miles of Jacumba in eastern San Diego County.

A preliminary estimate projects that the two blocked tunnels (numbers 8 and 16), will be cleared by September 2003. Additional repairs would include fire protection, drainage, and alignment improvements. The desert line will hopefully be open for revenue traffic by May 2004. In anticipation of that opening date, Carrizo Gorge Railway is meeting with Imperial Valley interests for potential gypsum and hay shipments.

SANDAG studies in the late 1990's estimated that reopening the SD&AE Railway for basic service would cost \$43 million. This included repairs, reliability measures, staging and intermodal yards. Under basic service the Desert Line would be rehabilitated to handle single-stack intermodal traffic and "conventional" rail carload traffic such as bulk commodities. An intermodal transfer facility to gather and distribute potential diversions of truck traffic passing through the SD&AE's service territory also would be built in the San Diego area. Potential funding for some improvements could come from the \$10 million authorized by Congress in TEA-21 for rail facilities north of the San Ysidro border crossing.



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 12, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **4**

**Action Requested: RECOMMEND**

## REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

### **Introduction**

The Regionally Significant Transportation Network (“Network”) is being developed for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and will include existing and planned regional transit services, highway corridors, and selected regional arterials. The Network provides essential mobility throughout the region and should include SANDAG’s highest priority projects for funding. Funding of specific projects would still be based upon Board adopted criteria and project rankings. The Network would be the focus of SANDAG’s regional performance monitoring and congestion management programs.

Proposed highway corridors and regional transit services were presented to the Transportation Committee at its August 8, 2002 meeting. The Committee recommended that all interstate and state highways and all regional transit services outlined in the Mobility Network of the preliminary draft 2030 RTP (Mobility 2030) be included in the Network. The selected arterial option will be combined with the recommended highway and transit components to form the Network. The Network would be available for review and comment as part of the Draft 2030 RTP scheduled for release at the October 2002 SANDAG Board meeting. The Network would be finalized as part of the Final 2030 RTP scheduled for Board approval in February/March 2003.

### **Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend one of the three arterial options and recommend incorporating the Regionally Significant Transportation Network in the Draft 2030 RTP.

- Option 1 – Critical Links (shown in Attachment 1 and listed in Attachment 2)
- Option 2 – Critical Links & Connectors (shown in Attachment 3 and listed in Attachment 4)
- Option 3 – Modified Critical Links & Connectors (defined in the footnotes of Attachments 3 and 4)

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) recommends Option 2, and SANDAG staff recommends Option 3.

### **Discussion**

Criteria for developing the Network were discussed by the Board at its June 14, 2002 Policy meeting and by the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) at its July 25 and August 22, 2002 meetings. The criteria used to update the 777-mile Regional Arterial System, approved by the

Board in August 2002, was used as a starting point for developing criteria for the arterial component of the Network.

Eight criteria are used to define the arterial component of the Network with emphasis placed on the Critical Link and Connector criteria. Critical Links are defined as arterials that provide congestion relief in high volume corridors. All designated Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP) arterials are considered Critical Links. Connectors are defined as arterials that provide direct connections between communities ensuring system continuity. The eight criteria are defined in Attachment 5 and are applied to the entire Regional Arterial System in Attachment 6.

### **Network Development**

Planned arterial network development projects include traffic signal interconnection, traffic monitoring infrastructure, roadway widening, and roadway extensions. These projects are defined by the cities and county circulation elements. SANDAG is not recommending projects beyond those contained in the cities and county approved Circulation Elements.

The Critical Links option contains 169 miles of roadway and the Critical Links & Connectors option contains 346 miles of roadway. The estimated cost of the planned projects for the Critical Links option is \$200 million and for the Critical Links and Connectors option is \$700 million. It is assumed that SANDAG would be responsible for funding a portion of the cost of the planned improvements for the selected network option.

### **Staff Recommended Option 3**

Option 3 (Modified Critical Links & Connectors) is very similar to Option 2 (Critical Links & Connectors). Under Option 3, two arterials are removed from the Critical Links & Connectors exhibit and listing, shown in Attachment 3 and Attachment 4. These arterials are Camino Del Mar in the City of Del Mar and Citracado Parkway in the City of Escondido and County of San Diego. These arterials were originally recommended by CTAC at its August 22, 2002 meeting. Upon further review by SANDAG staff, these arterials do not meet the criteria for the Network and are not recommended for inclusion in the Network.

The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting  
SANDAG's Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.

<b>Option 1 - Critical Links</b>	
<b>Arterial</b>	<b>Limits</b>
Balboa Ave	I-5 - I-15
Black Mountain Rd/Kearny Villa Rd/Ruffin Rd	SR 56 - Balboa Ave
Coast Hwy/Carlsbad Blvd/Hwy 101	I-5 (Oceanside) - Via De La Valle
El Camino Real/ Manchester Ave	SR 76 - I-5
El Cajon Blvd/Washington St	Pacific Hwy - I-8
Fletcher Pkwy/Broadway/E Main St/Greenfield Dr	I-8 - I-8
Friars Rd/Mission Gorge Rd	Morena Blvd - I-8
Genesee Ave/N. Torrey Pines Rd/Carmel Valley Rd	SR 163 - El Camino Real
H Street	I-5 - SR 125
Harbor Dr	Pacific Hwy - I-5 (National City)
Market St/Imperial Ave/Lemon Grove Ave	Harbor Dr - SR94
Mira Mesa Blvd	Sorrento Valley Rd - I-15
National City Blvd/Broadway/Beyer Blvd	Harbor Dr - SR 905
Pacific Highway/Sea World Dr/Morena Blvd	Harbor Dr - Balboa Ave
Palomar Airport Rd/San Marcos Blvd	Carlsbad Blvd - Mission Rd
Scripps Poway Pkwy	I-15 - SR 67
Via de la Valle/El Camino Real/Carmel Mtn Rd/Vista Sorrento Pkwy/Sorrento Valley Blvd/Vista Sorrento Pkwy	Hwy 101 - Mira Mesa Blvd
Vista Way/South Santa Fe Ave/Mission Rd/Mission Ave	Jefferson St/SR78 - Centre City Pkwy

The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting  
SANDAG's Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.

<b>Option 2 - Critical Links and Connectors</b>	
<b>Arterial</b>	<b>Limits</b>
Balboa Ave	I-5 - I-15
Bear Valley Pkwy	I-15 - Valley Pkwy
Black Mountain Rd/Kearny Villa Rd/Ruffin Rd	SR 56 - Balboa Ave
<del>Camino Del Mar</del>	<del>Via De La Valle - Carmel Valley Rd</del>
Cannon Rd	Carlsbad Blvd - SR 78
Centre City Pkwy	I-15(N) - I-15(S)
<del>Citracado Pkwy</del>	<del>SR 78 - I-15</del>
Clairemont Mesa Blvd	Genesse Ave - I-15
Coast Hwy/Carlsbad Blvd/Hwy 101	I-5 (Oceanside) - Via De La Valle
College Ave	SR 94 - I-8
College Blvd	El Camino Real - SR 76
Deer Springs Rd/Twin Oaks Vly Rd/San Elijo Rd	I-15 - Rancho Santa Fe Rd
Del Dios Hwy/Via De La Valle/Paseo Delicitas/Valley Pkwy	El Camino Real - I-15
Del Mar Heights/Black Mtn Rd/Carmel Valley Rd/Bernardo Ctr	I-5 - I-15
El Camino Real/ Manchester Ave	SR 76 - I-5
El Cajon Blvd/Washington St	Pacific Hwy - I-8
Euclid Ave/54th St	Plaza Blvd - El Cajon Blvd
Fletcher Pkwy/Broadway/E Main St/Greenfield Dr	I-8 - I-8
Friars Rd/Mission Gorge Rd	Morena Blvd - I-8
Garnet Ave/Grand Ave	I-5 - Mission Blvd
Genesee Ave/N. Torrey Pines Rd/Carmel Valley Rd	SR 163 - El Camino Real
H Street	I-5 - SR 125
Harbor Dr	Pacific Hwy - I-5 (National City)
Harbor Dr	Rosecrans St - Pacific Hwy
La Jolla Village Dr/Miramar Rd	I-5 - I-15
Market St/Imperial Ave/Lemon Grove Ave	Harbor Dr - SR94
Melrose Dr	SR76 - Rancho Santa Fe Rd
Mira Mesa Blvd	Sorrento Valley Rd - I-15
National City Blvd/Broadway/Beyer Blvd	Harbor Dr - SR 905
Nimitz Blvd	I-8 - Harbor Dr
Oceanside Blvd	Coast Hwy - Melrose Dr
Pacific Highway/Sea World Dr/Morena Blvd	Harbor Dr - Balboa Ave
Palomar St/Orange Ave/Olympic Pkwy	I-5 - SR 125
Palomar Airport Rd/San Marcos Blvd	Carlsbad Blvd - Mission Rd
Plaza Blvd/Paradise Valley Rd/Jamacha Blvd/Rd	I-5 - I-8
Pomerado Rd	I-15 (N) - I-15 (S)
Rancho Santa Fe Rd/Olivenhain Rd/Leucadia Blvd	South Santa Fe - Coast Hwy
Rosecrans St	I-8 - Harbor Dr.
Scripps Poway Pkwy	I-15 - SR 67
Siempre Viva Rd/Heritage Rd	SR 125 - SR 905
Via de la Valle/El Camino Real/Carmel Mtn Rd/Vista Sorrento Pkwy/Sorrento Valley Blvd/Vista Sorrento Pkwy	Hwy 101 - Mira Mesa Blvd
Valley Pkwy	I-15 - Bear Valley Pkwy
Vista Way/South Santa Fe Ave/Mission Rd/Mission Ave	Jefferson St/SR78 - Centre City Pkwy

Note: arterials shown in ~~strikeout~~ are included in Option 2 but are not included in arterial network Option 3

## REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

(Draft: September 12, 2002)

The Regionally Significant Transportation Network (Network) constitutes that part of the arterial, highway and transit system which provides for essential mobility throughout the region. At this time, all Interstate and State highways and all transit services outlined in the Mobility Network of the Preliminary Draft 2030 RTP are included in the Network. Eight criteria define the arterial component of the Network. Smart Growth exhibits depicting 2030 congestion, future traffic volumes, employment density, population density, activity centers, and the Regional Transit Vision have been used to evaluate arterials for the Network. The eight criteria, their definition, and methodology for applying the criteria are as follows:

- 1. Critical Link:** Provides congestion relief in high volume corridors. Arterials parallel to congested freeways or arterials that serve as a major thoroughfare receive full credit. For criteria #3 through #8 the arterial also must score a combined 2.5 points (one point for an "X" – full credit and half a point for a "P" – partial credit). Congested freeways are identified in the Draft 2002 Congestion Management Program (CMP). All designated CMP arterials receive full credit. Arterials that serve as major thoroughfares are defined as arterials with projected volumes over 40,000 average daily trips (ADT) without a parallel highway within three miles. No partial credit is given for this criterion.
- 2. Connector:** Provides direct connections between communities ensuring system continuity. Communities are defined as areas with a population density greater than 1,500 per quarter square mile in 2030. Arterials receive full credit that are longer than three miles and for criteria #3 through #8 score a combined 2.5 points (one point for a "X" – full credit and half a point for a "P" – partial credit). Full credit also is given to arterials that connect communities, are longer than six miles, projected to have volumes on any part over 20,000 ADT, and without a parallel Critical Link, Connector, or highway within three miles. No partial credit is given for this criterion.
- 3. Population:** Located in areas with high concentrations of existing and future populations. Arterials located in areas with a population density of 1,500 to 3,000 persons per quarter square mile in 2030 will receive partial credit. Arterials located in areas with a population density greater than 3,000 persons per quarter square mile in 2030 will receive full credit.
- 4. Employment:** Linking areas with high concentrations of existing or future employment. Arterials serving areas with employment densities of 1,500 to 3,000 employees per quarter square mile in 2030 will receive partial credit. Arterials serving areas with employment densities of greater than 3,000 employees per quarter square mile in 2030 will receive full credit.
- 5. Activity Centers:** Activity centers are defined as hospitals, retail centers over 75,000 square feet, major entertainment centers, casinos, major hotels, colleges and universities. Arterials linking at least one activity center per two miles will receive partial credit. Arterials linking at least one activity center per one mile will receive full credit.
- 6. Future Traffic:** Generally accommodate high traffic volumes. Arterials with over 20,000 average daily trips (ADT) in 2030 will receive partial credit. Arterials with over 20,000 ADT and with segments over 40,000 ADT will receive full credit.
- 7. Regional Transit Service:** Accommodate Regional Transit Service. Arterials slated for a future Regional Transit Service will receive partial credit. Arterials slated for multiple future Regional Transit Service will receive full credit.
- 8. Intermodal:** Provide access to intermodal facilities. Arterials serving a major freight, port, military or airport facility will receive partial credit. Arterials serving multiple freight, port, military or airport facilities will receive full credit.

## Regionally Significant Transportation Network Evaluation

Arterial	Limits	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Critical Link	Connector	Population	Employment	Activity Centers	High ADT	Regional Transit Vision	Intermodal
24th St	I-5 - Terminal Ave	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	X
32nd St/Wabash Blvd	Harbor Dr - I-5	-	-	P	X	-	-	P	X
30th St/Sweetwater Rd/Willow St	National City Blvd - Bonita Rd	-	-	P	P	P	P	-	-
70th St/Lake Murray Blvd	University Ave - Navajo Rd	-	-	X	-	X	P	-	-
Ardath/Torrey Pines/Girard/Pearl/La Jolla Blvd/Mission Blvd	I-5 - Grand Ave	-	-	X	X	-	P	P	-
Balboa Ave	I-5 - I-15	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	-
Ballantyne St/Avocado Ave/Avocado Blvd	Broadway - SR94	-	-	P	-	-	P	P	-
Bear Valley Pkwy *	I-15 - Valley Pkwy	-	X	P	-	-	X	-	-
Black Mountain Rd/Kearny Villa Rd/Ruffin Rd	SR 56 - Balboa Ave	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	P
Bobier Dr	Melrose Dr - E. Vista Way	-	-	P	P	-	-	-	-
Borden Rd/El Norte Pkwy	Las Posas Rd - Valley Center Rd	-	-	P	-	P	-	-	-
Borrego Springs Rd/Yaqui Pass Rd	Palm Canyon Dr - SR 78	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bradley Ave	Marshall Ave - 2nd St	-	-	X	P	-	-	-	-
Broadway (Lemon Grove)/Federal Blvd	SR94/125/Spring St - SR94	-	-	P	-	P	-	P	-
Broadway (Vista)	W. Vista Way/SR78 - So Santa Fe Av	-	-	X	P	P	P	X	-
Buckman Springs Rd/Old Hwy 80/Sunrise Hwy	SR 94 - SR 79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Camino Del Mar	Via De La Valle - Carmel Valley Rd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Camino del Norte/Twin Peaks Rd	Camino Ruiz - Espola Rd	-	-	P	-	-	X	P	-
Camino Del Rio North	Mission Center Rd - Mission Gorge Rd	-	-	X	P	X	-	-	-
Camino Ruiz	Camino del Norte - SR56	-	-	P	P	-	-	P	-
Camino Santa Fe Ave	Sorrento Valley Blvd - Miramar Rd	-	-	-	X	-	P	-	-
Cannon Rd *	Carlsbad Blvd - SR78	-	X	P	P	-	-	-	-
Carlsbad Village Dr	I-5 - Coast Blvd/Coast Hwy	-	-	P	-	-	P	-	-
Centre City Pkwy	I-15(N) - I-15(S)	-	X	X	P	X	X	P	-
Citracado Pkwy	SR 78 - I-15	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-
Clairemont Mesa Blvd	Genesse Ave - I-15	-	X	P	X	P	X	P	-
Coast Hwy/Carlsbad Blvd/Hwy 101	I-5 (Oceanside) - Via De La Valle	X	X	P	P	P	P	X	P
College Ave	SR 94 - I-8	-	X	P	X	X	-	P	-
College Blvd	North River Rd - Palomar Airport Rd	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	-
Community Rd	Twin Peaks Rd - Scripps Poway Pkwy	-	-	-	X	X	P	P	-
Convoy St	Linda Vista Rd - SR 52	-	-	-	X	P	P	P	-

X: Supports, P: Partially Supports, - : Does not support, Shaded: Critical Link and or Connector

\* Connector > six miles, 20,000 ADT, without parallel Network arterial within three miles.



## Regionally Significant Transportation Network Evaluation

Arterial	Limits	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Critical Link	Connector	Population	Employment	Activity Centers	High ADT	Regional Transit Vision	Intermodal
Crosby St	I-5 - Harbor Dr	-	-	X	P	X	P	P	X
Cuyamaca St	Mission Gorge Rd - Marshall Ave	-	-	X	X	P	P	P	-
Deer Springs Rd/Twin Oaks Vly Rd/San Elijo Rd *	I-15 - Rancho Santa Fe Rd	-	X	-	P	-	P	-	-
Dehesa Road	Jamacha Rd - Harbisonn Canyon Rd	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-
Del Dios Hwy/Via De La Valle/Paseo Delicitas/Valley Pkwy *	El Camino Real - I-15	-	X	-	P	-	-	-	-
Del Mar Heights/Black Mtn Rd/Carmel Valley Rd/Bernardo Ctr *	I-5 - I-15	-	X	P	-	-	P	P	-
Discovery St/Barham Dr	San Marcos Blvd -Mission Rd	-	-	P	P	-	P	P	-
Douglas Dr/North River Rd	SR 76 - SR 76	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-
E St/Bonita Rd	I-5 - Otay Lakes Rd	-	-	-	P	-	X	-	P
El Camino Real/ Manchester Ave	SR 76 - I-5	X	X	P	X	X	X	P	-
El Cajon Blvd	Chase Ave - Washington Ave	-	-	P	P	-	P	P	-
El Cajon Blvd/Washington St	Pacific Hwy - I-8	X	X	X	P	X	P	X	-
Encinitas Blvd	First St - El Camino Real	-	-	-	X	P	P	P	-
Euclid Ave/54th St *	Plaza Blvd - El Cajon Blvd	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-
Fairmount Ave	I-8 - El Cajon Blvd	-	-	-	-	-	X	P	-
Faraday Ave	Melrose Dr - College Blvd	-	-	-	X	-	P	P	-
Fletcher Pkwy/Broadway/E Main St/Greenfield Dr	I-8 - I-8	X	X	P	X	X	P	X	-
Friars Rd/Mission Gorge Rd	Morena Blvd - I-8	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	-
Garnet Ave/Grand Ave	I-5 - Mission Blvd	-	X	X	X	X	X	P	-
Genesse Ave/N. Torrey Pines Rd/Carmel Valley Rd	SR 163 - El Camino Real	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	-
Gilman Dr	La Jolla Village Dr - I-5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H Street	I-5 - SR 125	X	X	X	P	X	X	P	-
Harbor Dr	Pacific Hwy - I-5 (National City)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Harbor Dr	Rosecrans St - Pacific Hwy	-	X	-	P	X	X	X	X
Hunte Pkwy	Proctor Valley Rd - SR 125	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson Dr	Mission Gorge Rd - I-8	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Kettner Blvd	I-5 - India St	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X
L St/Telegraph Canyon Rd/Otay Lakes Rd	I-5 - SR94	-	-	P	P	-	X	P	X
La Costa Ave	Carlsbad Blvd - El Camino Real	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
La Jolla Village Dr/Miramar Rd	I-5 - I-15	-	X	P	X	P	X	P	P
Lake Wohlford Rd	Valley Ctr Rd - Valley Ctr Rd	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-

X: Supports, P: Partially Supports, - : Does not support, Shaded: Critical Link and or Connector

\* Connector > six miles, 20,000 ADT, without parallel Network arterial within three miles.

## Regionally Significant Transportation Network Evaluation

Arterial	Limits	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Critical Link	Connector	Population	Employment	Activity Centers	High ADT	Regional Transit Vision	Intermodal
Las Posas Rd/Buena Creek Rd	Discovery St - Twin Oaks Valley Rd	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-
Laurel St	North Harbor Dr - I-5	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X
Leucadia Blvd/Olivenhain Rd	1st St - Rancho Santa Fe Rd	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Linda Vista Rd	Morena Blvd - Convoy St	-	-	X	-	-	-	P	-
Lomas Santa Fe Ave	I-5 - Coast Hwy	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-
Lytton St/Barnett Ave	Rosecrans St - Pacific Highway	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-
Main St	I-5 - Heritage Rd	-	-	P	-	-	X	-	-
Manchester Ave	El Camino Real - I-5	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-
Mapleview St/Lake Jennings Rd	SR67 - I-8	-	-	P	P	-	P	-	-
Market St/Imperial Ave/Lemon Grove Ave	Harbor Dr - SR94	X	X	X	P	X	-	P	P
Marshall Ave	Cuyamaca St - Washington Ave	-	-	-	X	P	-	P	-
Massachusetts Ave	Broadway - Lemon Grove Ave	-	-	-	P	-	P	-	-
Melrose Dr *	SR76 - Rancho Santa Fe Rd	-	X	P	P	-	X	-	-
Mira Mesa Blvd	Sorrento Valley Rd - I-15	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	-
Mission Ave	Escondido Blvd - Broadway Ave	-	-	P	P	P	P	-	-
Mission Ave	Coast Hwy - Frazee Rd	-	-	-	P	P	-	P	P
Mission Road (S-13; incl. Main St in Fallbrook)	I-15 - SR76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mission Gorge Rd/Woodside Ave	I-8 - SR67	-	-	-	X	P	P	-	-
Montezuma Rd	Fairmount Ave - El Cajon Blvd	-	-	P	P	P	X	-	-
Montezuma Valley Rd/Palm Canyon Dr/Peg Leg Rd/Borrego Seaway	San Felipe Rd - Imperial Co Line	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
National City Blvd/Broadway/Beyer Blvd	Harbor Dr - SR 905	X	X	X	X	X	P	-	-
Navajo Rd	I-8 - Fletcher Pkwy	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-
Nimitz Blvd	I-8 - Harbor Dr	-	X	X	-	-	X	-	P
Nobel Dr	I-5 - I-805	-	-	X	-	X	P	X	-
North Santa Fe Ave	SR76 - Melrose Dr	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oceanside Blvd	Coast Hwy - Melrose Dr	-	X	X	P	P	P	-	-
Old Highway 80	SR79 - Sunrise Hwy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Old Highway 80	Buckman Springs Rd - I-8 (In-ko-pah)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Otay Lakes Rd/La Media Rd	Bonita Rd - SR905	-	-	X	-	P	-	-	-
Otay Mesa Rd	SR905 - Heritage Rd	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P
Pacific Highway/Sea World Dr/Morena Blvd	Harbor Dr - Balboa Ave	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

X: Supports, P: Partially Supports, - : Does not support, Shaded: Critical Link and or Connector

\* Connector > six miles, 20,000 ADT, without parallel Network arterial within three miles.

## Regionally Significant Transportation Network Evaluation

Arterial	Limits	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Critical Link	Connector	Population	Employment	Activity Centers	High ADT	Regional Transit Vision	Intermodal
Palm Ave/Ocean View Hills Pkwy	I-5 - SR905	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	P
Palomar St/Orange Ave/Olympic Pkwy	I-5 - SR 125	-	X	X	P	P	X	-	-
Palomar Airport Rd/San Marcos Blvd	Carlsbad Blvd - Mission Rd	X	X	P	X	P	X	P	-
Paseo Ranchero/Heritage Rd	East H St - Siempre Viva Rd	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-
Plaza Blvd/Paradise Valley Rd/Jamacha Blvd/Rd *	I-5 - I-8	-	X	P	-	-	P	-	-
Poinsettia Lane	Calrsbad Blvd - Melrose Dr	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-
Pomerado Rd *	I-15 (N) - I-15 (S)	-	X	P	-	P	-	P	-
Rancho Bernardo Rd/Espola Rd	I-15 - Poway Rd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rancho Del Oro Dr	SR 78 - SR 76	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-
Rancho Penasquitos Blvd/Poway Rd	SR56 - SR67	-	-	P	-	P	X	-	-
Rancho Santa Fe Rd/Olivenhain Rd/Leucadia Blvd *	South Santa Fe - Coast Hwy	-	X	P	P	-	X	-	-
Regents Rd	Genesse Ave - SR 52	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-
Rosecrans St	I-8 - Harbor Dr	-	X	P	X	P	X	P	-
San Felipe Rd/Great Southern Overland Route	SR 79 - Imperial Co Line	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scripps Poway Pkwy	I-15 - SR 67	X	X	-	P	-	X	P	-
Siempre Viva Rd/Heritage Rd	SR 125 - SR 905	-	X	-	X	-	P	-	X
Via de la Valle/El Camino Real/Carmel Mtn Rd/Vista Sorrento Pkwy	Hwy 101 - Mira Mesa Blvd	X	X	P	X	P	P	X	-
Sorrento Valley Blvd	Sorrento Valley Rd - Camino Santa Fe /	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
Sports Arena Blvd	Sea World Dr - Rosecrans St/SR209	-	-	-	P	X	X	P	-
Spring St	I-8 - SR125	-	-	P	-	-	P	P	-
Sunrise Highway	SR79 - I-8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunset Cliffs Blvd/Sea World Dr	I-8 - Morena Blvd	-	-	-	P	-	X	-	-
Sweetwater Road	Broadway - Troy St	-	-	P	-	-	-	P	-
Sycamore Avenue	South Santa Fe Ave - Melrose Dr	-	-	-	P	-	X	P	-
Ted Williams Pkwy/Twin Peaks Rd	I-15 - Espola Rd	-	-	-	-	-	X	P	-
Torrey Pines Rd	Ardath Rd - La Jolla Village Dr	-	-	P	X	-	-	-	-
University Ave/La Mesa Blvd/Grossmont Center Dr	54th St - Fletcher Pkwy	-	-	X	P	P	-	P	-
Valley Pkwy	I-15 - Bear Valley Pkwy	-	X	X	P	P	X	-	-
Vandegrift Blvd	North River Rd - Camp Pendleton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Via Rancho Pkwy	Del Dios Hwy - I-15	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Vista Way/South Santa Fe Ave/Mission Rd/Mission Ave	Jefferson St/SR78 - Centre City Pkwy	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	-

X: Supports, P: Partially Supports, - : Does not support, Shaded: Critical Link and or Connector

\* Connector > six miles, 20,000 ADT, without parallel Network arterial within three miles.

## Regionally Significant Transportation Network Evaluation

Arterial	Limits	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Critical Link	Connector	Population	Employment	Activity Centers	High ADT	Regional Transit Vision	Intermodal
West Main St	I-8 - Marshall Ave	-	-	-	-	-	P	X	-
Washington Ave	El Cajon Blvd - Jamacha Rd	-	-	X	P	-	P	-	-
Willows Road	I-8 - Viejas Casino Rd	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-
Winter Gardens Blvd/2nd St/Jamacha Rd	SR67 - SR94	-	-	X	P	X	P	-	-
Woodland Dr	Barham Dr - El Norte Pkwy	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-

X: Supports, P: Partially Supports, - : Does not support, Shaded: Critical Link and or Connector  
 \* Connector > six miles, 20,000 ADT, without parallel Network arterial within three miles.

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 12, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

**Action Requested: REVIEW AND COMMENT**

DRAFT 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – PROPOSED REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN

## **Introduction**

The preliminary draft 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Mobility 2030, was released on August 2, 2002, and is based on a \$41.3 billion Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. In accordance with federal regulations, the Draft 2030 RTP also must include a Revenue Constrained plan, which is driven by a tighter budget and more conservative financial assumptions. The proposed Revenue Constrained plan is based on \$29.9 billion of projected revenues.

## **Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to review and comment on the proposed Revenue Constrained plan for the Draft 2030 RTP. The Committee's comments will be incorporated into the Draft 2030 RTP, which is scheduled for release in October 2002.

## **Discussion**

### *Financial Assumptions*

The Revenue Constrained financial scenario has \$11.4 billion less revenue than the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. As shown in Attachment 1, the revenues not included in the Revenue Constrained scenario are a future extension of the *TransNet* half-cent sales tax beyond 2008 (\$6.9 billion), future increases in state or federal gas taxes or equivalent transportation revenue sources (\$3.6 billion), and a portion of future Federal Transit Administration (FTA) discretionary funding (\$0.9 billion). Attachment 2 summarizes the differences in major expenditures between the Reasonably Expected and Revenue Constrained financial scenarios.

One of the main differences between the Reasonably Expected Revenue and Revenue Constrained financial scenarios is the availability of flexible revenues for transit operations. Many of the available state and federal funding sources, such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), can only be used for capital improvements.

### *Initial Revenue Constrained Transit Network*

Under the Revenue Constrained financial scenario, the limited amount of flexible revenues available for transit operations limits the region's ability to implement an enhanced network of regional transit services. Given the level of funding available under the Revenue Constrained scenario, a double digit transit mode share during peak periods is not achieved.

The initial Revenue Constrained transit network (Attachment 3) includes eleven of the 18 new or improved transit routes included in Mobility 2030. Attachment 4 summarizes the differences between Mobility 2030 and initial Revenue Constrained transit routes, peak and off-peak service frequencies, and major capital improvements. Ten of the eleven routes included in the Revenue Constrained plan would operate at less frequent peak and/or offpeak headways than included in Mobility 2030.

Major transit capital improvements not included in the Revenue Constrained plan are the Kearny Mesa transitway and the coastal rail University City tunnel (Attachment 5). Because only about half of the regional transit services are included in the Revenue Constrained plan, lower levels of funding also are provided for rail grade separations, new/improved major transit stations and centers, direct access ramps to Managed/HOV lanes, and rail vehicles for the new services.

#### *Initial Revenue Constrained Highway Network*

The initial Revenue Constrained highway network (Attachment 6) is intended to complete a basic highway network that interconnects the San Diego region and provides a system of Managed/ High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities to support carpooling, vanpooling, and transit to major job centers. Attachment 7 summarizes the highway network differences between Mobility 2030 and the Revenue Constrained plan.

The initial Revenue Constrained highway network includes the completion of four-lane or six-lane facilities on State Routes 11, 52, 56, 125, and 905 as well as the highest ranking new freeway to freeway connections at I-5/SR 56, I-5/ SR 78, and SR 94/SR 125.

Major four-lane Managed facilities would be provided on Interstates 5, 15, and 805, and a two-lane Managed facility would be provided on SR 52 between I-15 and SR 125. These routes show the highest HOV demand. HOVs and transit would use the Managed lanes for free, and solo drivers would be able to pay a fee to use the lanes, similar to the existing I-15 FasTrak™ program. To provide system connectivity, conventional two-lane HOV facilities would be provided on State Routes 52 (I-805 to I-15) and SR 94/125, and four direct HOV to HOV connectors would be provided at I-5/I-805, I-15/I-805, I-15/SR 94, and I-805/SR 52.

#### *Local Streets and Roads*

As shown in Attachment 2, expenditures for new capital construction, and operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation of local streets and roads would be slightly lower under the Revenue Constrained plan than the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

The Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario included \$500 million for the various arterials. The Revenue Constrained plan includes the same level of funding. However, these regional funds would instead be designated for Regionally Significant Arterials (see Agenda Item no. 4). This shift in emphasis also should be considered for the Mobility 2030 plan, because the Regionally Significant Arterials provide connectivity to the regional transit and highway networks as well as alternate routes.

### *Land Use/ Systems Management/ Demand Management*

As shown in Attachment 2, the proposed Revenue Constrained plan includes the same levels of funding as the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario for the Smart Growth Incentive Pilot Program and Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies.

Given the funding limitations in the Revenue Constrained scenario, these improvements are recommended at their full funding levels, because they can be easily implemented and will help maximize the efficiency and reliability of the existing transportation system. Key TSM improvements include expansion of the Freeway Service Patrol, providing an Advanced Traveler Information System, and better traffic signal coordination. TDM programs include continuation of the Regional Vanpool Program as well as other RideLink programs and expanded outreach and promotion of teleworking and flexible work hours to employers and colleges and universities.

It is recommended that Bicycle/Pedestrian improvements be funded at a lower level in the Revenue Constrained plan (\$85 million instead of \$200 million). This lower level is consistent with continuation of the existing levels of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding for these types of improvements. In the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario, the additional funding for Bicycle/Pedestrian improvements was assumed to come with a future extension of *TransNet*. An option would be to fund Bicycle/Pedestrian improvements at the full \$200 million by eliminating proposed transit or highway improvements or by reducing funding for regionally significant arterials, land use, TSM, or TDM strategies.

### *Working Group Comments*

On August 27, 2002, the 2030 RTP Working Group reviewed and discussed the initial Revenue Constrained transit and highway networks. Major comments are as follows:

- Improve the regional transit system outward from the urban core – The Working Group was concerned that the improvements included in the initial Revenue Constrained transit network were too spread out, and that existing and planned land uses and densities did not support extending/expanding regional transit service into suburban areas of the region. The Working Group suggested that the Revenue Constrained Plan first give priority to providing transit in dense, urban areas within the central part of the region.
- Reward jurisdictions that are officially implementing Smart Growth general plan updates – Several members of the Working Group felt that transit improvements only should be made in jurisdictions that are actively updating their general plans, and should not be made in the jurisdictions that have proposed Smart Growth commitments, but are not actively updating their general plans to include those commitments. In addition, the Working Group suggested that the Revenue Constrained plan include improvements along I-8 in the Mission Valley area and along SR 54 near the City of Chula Vista to support Smart Growth land use planning in those areas.
- Reconsider the proposed capital improvements in the coastal rail corridor – Given the limited funding available under the Revenue Constrained scenario, the Working Group questioned the cost-effectiveness and regional benefit of expending \$780 million to double

track the Coastal Rail corridor and to build a tunnel at Del Mar. Working Group members suggested that the UTC tunnel may have greater regional benefit, because it would improve travel times for the Coaster commuter rail and would tie into planned redevelopment in the UTC area.

- Include more Managed/HOV facilities in the Revenue Constrained plan – Members of the Working Group felt that more of the Managed/HOV lane facilities from the Mobility 2030 network should be included in the Revenue Constrained plan. Some members questioned the appropriateness of providing an HOV lane on I-15 north of SR 78 in lieu of HOV improvements closer to the central portion of the region, such as a two-lane HOV facility on SR 54/SR125. The Working Group also suggested the addition of more direct HOV to HOV connectors (e.g., I-805/SR 54) beyond the original six included in the Mobility 2030 network.

To respond to the comments from the 2030 RTP Working Group, staff is evaluating alternative Revenue Constrained transit and highway networks. Results of these evaluations will be presented at the Transportation Committee meeting.



**2030 RTP — MAJOR REVENUE SOURCES**

(Differences between the Reasonably Expected and Revenue Constrained scenarios are shaded.)

REVENUE SOURCES	ESTIMATED REVENUE (\$MILLIONS)	
	REASONABLY EXPECTED	REVENUE CONSTRAINED
<b>Local</b>		
<i>TransNet</i>	\$7,900	\$1,005
Transportation Development Act (TDA)	\$3,800	\$3,800
City/County Local Gas Taxes	\$2,200	\$2,200
General Fund/Other	\$4,100	\$4,100
Toll Road Funding	\$600	\$600
Miscellaneous/Carry-over From Prior Years	<u>\$500</u>	<u>\$500</u>
Subtotal	\$19,100	\$12,205
<b>State</b>		
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$3,800	\$3,800
Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)/Proposition 42	\$1,600	\$1,600
State Transit Assistance (STA) Program	\$500	\$500
State Highway Operations & Protection Program (SHOPP)/Other	\$4,400	\$4,400
Future Gas Tax or Equivalent Revenue	\$1,800	\$0
Miscellaneous/Carry-over From Prior Years	<u>\$2,100</u>	<u>\$2,100</u>
Subtotal	\$14,200	\$12,400
<b>Federal</b>		
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Discretionary	\$1,700	\$800
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Formula	\$1,800	\$1,800
Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP)	\$800	\$800
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program	\$900	\$900
Future Gas Tax or Equivalent Revenue	\$1,800	\$0
Miscellaneous/Carry-over From Prior Years	<u>\$1,005</u>	<u>\$1,005</u>
Subtotal	\$8,005	\$5,305
<b>Total</b>	\$41,305	\$29,910

**2030 RTP — MAJOR EXPENDITURES**

(Differences between the Reasonably Expected and Revenue Constrained scenarios are shaded.)

PROJECT CATEGORIES	ESTIMATED COST (\$MILLIONS)	
	REASONABLY EXPECTED	REVENUE CONSTRAINED
<b>SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT &amp; OPERATIONS</b>		
<i>Managed/High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes</i>	\$6,900	\$4,209
<i>Transit</i>		
Major New Capital Facilities	\$8,600 <sup>1</sup>	\$4,368
Operating Subsidies	\$5,400 <sup>1</sup>	\$3,832
Rehabilitation/Replacement/Miscellaneous Capital	<u>\$1,800<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>\$1,505</u>
Subtotal	\$15,800	\$9,705
<i>Highways</i>		
System Completion/Widening	\$3,805	\$2,511
Operations/Maintenance/Rehabilitation	<u>\$4,400</u>	<u>\$4,400</u>
Subtotal	\$8,205	\$6,911
<i>Local Streets and Roads</i>		
New Capital Construction	\$4,400	\$3,800
<del>Regional Arterial System</del> Regionally Significant Arterials	\$500	\$500
Operations/Maintenance/Rehabilitation	<u>\$4,700</u>	<u>\$4,100</u>
Subtotal	\$9,600	\$8,400
<b>LAND USE/SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT/DEMAND MANAGEMENT</b>		
<i>Other</i>		
Smart Growth Incentive Pilot Program	\$25	\$25
Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	\$200	\$85
Transportation Systems Management	\$440	\$440
Transportation Demand Management	<u>\$135</u>	<u>\$135</u>
Subtotal	\$800	\$685
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$41,305</b>	<b>\$29,910</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised from August 2, 2002 preliminary draft Mobility 2030.

The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting  
SANDAG's Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.

**2030 RTP — NEW OR IMPROVED TRANSIT ROUTES**

(Differences between the Mobility 2030 plan and Revenue Constrained services are shaded.)

Seq. #	DESCRIPTION	PEAK/OFFPEAK HEADWAYS (minutes)	
		MOBILITY 2030	REVENUE CONSTRAINED
1	Increase in Existing Coaster Service <sup>1</sup>	20/60	20/60
2	Increase in Oceanside to Escondido Rail Service	10/10	15/30
3	Escondido to Sorrento Mesa via I-15/Mira Mesa Boulevard	10/30 <sup>2</sup>	Not included
4	Oceanside to Escondido via Palomar Airport Road	10/10 <sup>2</sup>	Not included
5	Northeast Oceanside to Sorrento Mesa via El Camino Real/I-5	10/10 <sup>2</sup>	10/--
6	Increase in Existing Blue Line Trolley Service	7½/7½ <sup>2</sup>	7½/10
7	Increase in Existing Orange Line Trolley Service	7½/15-30 <sup>3</sup>	15/15-30 <sup>3</sup>
8	Mid-Coast from Old Town to Sorrento Mesa	7½/15	7½/15 & 15/30 <sup>4</sup>
9	Escondido to Centre City & Airport via I-15/ SR 94	5/10	10/30
10	El Cajon Boulevard to Centre City	5/10	10/10
11	Old Town to <del>Balboa Station</del> Kearny Mesa via Mission Boulevard/ <del>Balboa Avenue</del>	10/10	10/30
12	Old Town to Kearny Mesa via Linda Vista	10/15	Not included
13	32nd Street to Kearny Mesa via I-15/Kearny Mesa Transitway	5/10 <sup>2</sup>	Not included
14	Coronado to Sorrento Mesa via Hillcrest/Genesee Avenue <sup>5</sup>	5/10	10/10
15	H Street Trolley to Eastlake via Southwestern College	10/10 <sup>2</sup>	Not included
16	Centre City to Otay Mesa via SR 94/I-805/Telegraph Canyon	5/10	10/10
17	El Cajon to Sorrento Mesa via SR 52	10/--	Not included
18	San Ysidro to Sorrento Mesa via I-805/I-15	5/10	Not included

<sup>1</sup> Major capital improvements under Mobility 2030 include double tracking and Del Mar and University City tunnels. University City tunnel not included in Revenue Constrained scenario.

<sup>2</sup> Improved peak and/or offpeak headways from August 2, 2002 preliminary draft Mobility 2030.

<sup>3</sup> Offpeak headways at 15 minutes to El Cajon and 30 minutes to Santee.

<sup>4</sup> LRT between Old Town and Balboa Station at 7½/15 minutes; Bus rapid transit (BRT) between Balboa Station and Sorrento Mesa at 15/30 minutes.

<sup>5</sup> Coronado to Centre City segment not included in Revenue Constrained scenario.

**2030 RTP — MAJOR TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS – REVENUE CONSTRAINED PLAN**  
(Differences between the Mobility 2030 plan and Revenue Constrained improvements and costs  
are in ~~strikeout~~ and shaded.)

Seq. #		Cost(\$ millions)
1	Mission Valley East Trolley Extension	\$424
2	Oceanside to Escondido Rail	\$352
3	Sorrento Mesa Transitway	\$500
4	<del>Kearny Mesa Transitway</del>	<del>\$300</del>
5	Mid-Coast Light Rail (LRT only from Old Town to Balboa Station)	\$590 <sup>1</sup> \$140
6	Oceanside-Escondido Rail Double Tracking <del>and North County Fair</del> <del>Extension</del>	\$165 <sup>1</sup> \$75
7	Coastal Rail Double Tracking <sup>2</sup>	\$420
8	Coastal Rail Tunnel at Del Mar <sup>2</sup>	\$360
9	<del>Coastal Rail Tunnel at University City<sup>2</sup></del>	<del>\$890</del>
10	Other Regional Rail Grade Separations	\$200 \$100
11	Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers	\$1,723 \$695
12	Direct Access Ramps to Managed/HOV Lanes	\$1,085 \$790
13	Rail Vehicles for New Regional Transit Services	\$555 \$272
14	Arterial Transit Priority Improvements	\$1,036 \$240
	Subtotal	\$8,600 \$4,368

<sup>1</sup> Cost estimate revised from August 2, 2002 preliminary draft Mobility 2030.

<sup>2</sup> Approximately 75 percent of funding assumed from non-local revenue sources (e.g., Amtrak or High Speed Rail).

The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting  
SANDAG's Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.

### 2030 RTP — MAJOR HIGHWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

(Differences between the Mobility 2030 plan and Revenue Constrained improvements and costs are in ~~strikeout~~ and shaded.)

HOV and Managed Lane Facilities					Cost (\$ millions)
Freeway	From	To	Existing	Improvements	
<del>I-5</del>	<del>SR 905</del>	SR 54	8F	8F + 2 HOV	\$255
<del>I-5</del>	SR 54	<del>I-8</del>	8F	8F + 2 HOV/ 10F	\$775
I-5	I-8	I-805	8F	10F + 2HOV/ 8F+2HOV	<del>\$320</del> \$220
I-5	I-805	Vandergrift SR 78	8F	10F+4ML/ 8F+4ML	<del>\$885</del> \$650
<del>I-8</del>	SR 125	Los Coches	8F/6F/4F	8F + 2HOV/6F+2HOV/6F	\$405
I-15	I-5	SR163	4F/6F/8F	8F/ 8F+2HOV	\$230
I-15	SR 163	SR 78	8F	8F+4ML/MB	\$644
I-15	SR 78	Riverside Co.	8F	8F + 2HOV/ 6F + 2HOV	<del>\$200</del> \$140
SR 52	I-805	SR 125	4F	6F + 2ML (Reversible)	\$220
<del>SR 54/SR 125</del>	<del>I-5</del>	SR 94	6F/4F+2HOV	6F + 2HOV	\$235
<del>SR 56</del>	<del>I-5</del>	<del>I-15</del>	4F	6F + 2HOV	\$180
SR 94/SR 125	I-5	I-8	8F/6F	8F + 2HOV	\$495
<del>SR 125</del>	<del>SR 905</del>	SR 54	4T	6T + 2HOV	\$170
I-805	SR 905	SR 54	8F	8F + 4ML/MB	\$300
I-805	SR 54	I-8	8F	8F + 4ML/MB	\$300
I-805	I-8	I-5	8F	8F + 4ML/MB	\$410
Subtotal					<del>\$6,024</del> \$3,609
HOV to HOV Connections					
Freeway	Intersecting Freeway	Movement			
I-5	I-805	North to North & South to South		\$150	
<del>I-15</del>	<del>SR 78</del>	<del>East to South &amp; North to West</del>		<del>\$150</del>	
I-15	I-805	North to North & South to South		\$150	
I-15	SR 94	South to West & East to North		\$150	
<del>SR 125</del>	<del>I-8</del>	<del>West to South &amp; North to East</del>		<del>\$150</del>	
I-805	SR 52	West to North & South to East		\$150	
Subtotal					<del>\$900</del> \$600

## Key:

C = Conventional Highway Lanes

T = Toll Road

ML = Managed Lanes (HOV &amp; Value Pricing)

F = Freeway Lanes

MB = Movable Barrier

HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes

Highway System Completion					Cost (\$ millions)
Freeway	From	To	Existing	Improvements	
SR 11	SR 905	Mexico	---	4F	\$185
SR 52	SR 125	SR 67	---	4F	\$289
SR 56	Camino Ruiz	Carmel Country	---	4F	\$128
SR 125	SR 905	San Miguel Rd.	---	4F 4T/6T	\$400 \$435
SR 125	San Miguel Rd	SR 54	---	4F	\$138
SR 125	Jamacha Rd.	SR 94	---	6F	\$166
SR 125	Navajo Rd	Grossmont	---	6F	\$73
SR 905	I-805	Mexico	---	4F	\$292
Subtotal					\$1,671 \$1,706

Highway and Arterial Widening					
Routes	From	To	Existing	Improvements	
I-5	I-805 Merge	---	10F	14F	\$185
I-5	SR 54	I-8	8F	Operational	\$200
SR 67	Mapleview St.	Dye Road	2C	4C	\$240
SR 76	Melrose Dr.	I-15	2C	4C	\$180
SR 78	I-5	I-15	6F	8F	\$830
SR 94	SR 125	Steele Canyon	4F/4C/2C	6F/6F/4F	\$85
SR 905	I-5	Mexico	4F	8F	\$215
Various Arterials Regionally Significant Arterials					\$500
Subtotal					\$2,236 \$885

New Freeway to Freeway Connections			
Freeway	Intersecting Freeway	Movement	
I-5	I-8	East to North & South to West	\$180
I-5	SR 56	West to North & South to East	\$140
I-5	SR 78	West to South & South to East	\$145 <sup>1</sup>
SR 94	SR 125	West to North & South to East	\$135 <sup>1</sup>
Subtotal			\$600 \$420

Key:

C = Conventional Highway Lanes

T = Toll Road

ML = Managed Lanes (HOV & Value Pricing)

F = Freeway Lanes

MB = Movable Barrier

HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes

<sup>1</sup> Cost estimate revised from Mobility 2030 to include carry-over funding from prior years.



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 12, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **6**

**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

I-5 / GENESEE AVENUE / SORRENTO VALLEY ROAD  
INTERCHANGES - PROJECT STUDY REPORT STATUS UPDATE

## **Introduction**

The City of San Diego, Caltrans, and SANDAG are jointly preparing a Project Study Report (PSR) in response to existing congestion and projected traffic demands at Genesee Avenue and Interstate 5, Sorrento Valley Road and Interstate 5, in Sorrento Valley, and along Interstate 5 between Genesee Avenue and Sorrento Valley Road. The PSR will incorporate all three of these major elements in developing alternatives that will provide a comprehensive solution for congestion in the study area. The PSR is the official programming document for Caltrans and is required before state and federal funds can be programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for subsequent development of the project(s).

Opportunities for improving traffic operations have been investigated by previous studies. The Sorrento Valley Circulation Study looked at the Sorrento Valley Road and Interstate 5 interchange as well as circulation around the Sorrento Valley area. Previous Genesee Avenue studies have focused on improvements needed for widening the Genesee Bridge over Interstate 5 to accommodate widening of Genesee Avenue on either side of the bridge. Alternatives developed in those studies will be brought forward for consideration in this study along with other preliminary alternatives developed in the initial analysis of the study area.

## **Discussion**

Past studies have not looked at the relationship of improvements proposed by the other studies nor have they considered all of the improvements anticipated that are just outside the study area. A few of these in-progress improvements are the Carmel Mountain Interchange with Interstate 5, the extension of Carroll Canyon Road, and the construction of Vista Sorrento Parkway. The permanent closure of Sorrento Valley Road from Carmel Mountain Road to Carmel Country Road is another recent development that will be taken into account. In addition, UCSD, the University Town Center mall, and the Sorrento Valley area all have plans for expansion that will affect traffic in the study area. Other associated studies that are being considered in the development of this PSR are the on going Mid-Coast Transportation Study and the Regional Transit Vision approved by the Board of Directors in November 2001. Close coordination with transit will be maintained throughout this study to insure overall mobility is maximized.

Staff will present the conceptual alternatives currently under review to the Transportation Committee. The final results of the study will be presented to the Transportation Committee in early 2003.