

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

October 17, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) at 9:05 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

### 1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]) and a second by Chair Pro Tem Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the August 1, 2008, meeting.

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

Lorraine Leighton, a member of the public spoke regarding an incident over Labor Day weekend on Bus Route 30 when she requested use of the wheelchair ramp because her leg was injured and was denied use of the ramp. She commented that the bus also smelled of urine.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public commented regarding the raid on the public transportation fund and the current financial crisis for public transportation. He expressed his concerns regarding future funding for public transportation.

Clive Richard, a member of the public commented regarding an article in *New York Times* about a small town with surplus funds and plans to expand transit. He commented that this town council spoke of local commitment which he felt is missing here in San Diego; local commitment equates to funding for public transportation.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) commented regarding the recent tragedy with the Metro Link line and stated that the majority of our rail system is double tracked so that situation would be unlikely to occur here. The only single track is in Santee and the schedule is set up so an incident like this would not happen. He stated that MTS has strict operating rules regarding cell phones. He said that phones must be off and carried off the person, such as in a back pack. The only authorized use is during meal breaks or off duty. If all other communications devices were to break down, the cell phone rule requires the driver to pull over and stop. He stated that all operators have been counseled this week to ensure compliance and understanding of the cell phone rule.

Chairman Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]) stated that the COASTER and the SPRINTER have the same rules regarding electronic devices. He stated that NCTD also has a default system in case a train passes a red light, the default system would cause the train to stop. Chairman Gallo stated that as with the recent ribbon cutting for the I-15 Express Lanes, our region is setting the tone for country on advancements in transportation.

### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

#### **3. STATE ROUTE (SR) 905/11 STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Chair Madaffer introduced the item and Bill Figge, Caltrans District 11 provided the monthly update of discussion by the SR 905 strike team and a monthly update on the status of SR 11.

Mr. Figge introduced a new Caltrans Corridor Director, Mario Orso. Mr. Orso is the Corridor Director for the SR 11 and the TCIF projects. He stated that SR 905 Phase 1A project is under construction and moving forward. Caltrans still faces legal action for four rights of way parcels so costs there are still unknown. Mr. Figge stated that Phase 1B of the project will go out for bid soon with the goal of opening bids in January 2009 and beginning construction in May 2009.

Mr. Figge stated that the key action for the SR 11 Otay Mesa East project is acquiring the Presidential Permit and finishing the Tier 1 Environmental Document He stated that Caltrans expects approval soon for both elements and then the project will move into the project specific environmental work.

Chair Madaffer stated that some Board members are participating in a trip to Washington D.C. sponsored by the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce next week. He commented that the delegation will meet with Transportation Secretary Mary Peters and asked Jack Boda, Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation to brief the Committee on the action items for potential funding for the region.

Mr. Boda stated that the delegation members will have three points to address with Secretary Peters. The first priority is getting the approval for the Presidential Permit for the SR 11 project. Also, to ask for a place holder for the Mid-Coast project for funding. Third, the San Francisco Region did not meet its requirements for their Urban Partnership Agreement and we are asking our delegation to push for those funds to be designated for our region for the Bus on Shoulders project.

### **REPORTS**

Chair Madaffer announced that the opening for the new I-15 Express Lanes will be Monday, September 22, 2008.

#### **5. FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR FY 2008 NEW FREEDOM AND FY 2009 SENIOR MINI-GRANT PROJECTS (RECOMMEND)**

Danielle Kochman, Assistant Transit Service Planner II presented the item and stated that SANDAG was selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the New Freedom federal funding programs for the San Diego urbanized area. The New Freedom program is eligible to fund operating, capital, and mobility management projects

providing new or expanded transportation services and facilities for persons with disabilities. The *TransNet* Extension ordinance includes the provision for a competitive grant program for senior transportation programs, which seeks to fund operating and capital projects providing specialized transportation services for seniors.

Ms. Kochman stated that the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and the *TransNet* Extension ordinance require that SANDAG conduct a competitive selection process to distribute the funds. Eligible applicants include private nonprofit organizations, governmental authorities, private and public transportation providers, and the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). The purpose of this competitive selection process is to evaluate potential projects and recommend which projects should be funded. A total of 18 proposals for 28 individual projects were received requesting Senior Mini-Grant funding, and seven proposals from six agencies were received requesting New Freedom funds. An amendment will be added to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) to include all Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom projects approved by the Board of Directors before the New Freedom projects are forwarded to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board approval for funding of the proposed list of projects for: Senior Mini-Grant projects totaling \$1,268,557 in *TransNet* funding for FY 2009, and \$2,405,638 for FY 2010 and FY 2011 as option years contingent upon satisfactory project performance in FY 2009; and New Freedom projects totaling \$1,201,001 in FTA funds the FY 2008 and FY 2009 two year period. The Transportation Committee also is asked to recommend an exemption from Board Policy No. 033 for the current Senior Mini-Grant competitive process given an inconsistency regarding the applicability of the policy to the *TransNet* Senior Mini-Grant Program.

Ms. Kochman stated that on February 15, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved the competitive process and evaluation criteria for allocating FY 2009 Senior Mini-Grant funds. A five-member outside review committee was established composed of individuals and agencies that work closely with seniors. In addition to two seniors familiar with transportation issues, the panel had representatives from Adult Protective Services, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), and Caltrans. The members of this review committee scored each project against the adopted evaluation criteria and not relative to other projects. These scores were then used to rank the projects.

Ms. Kochman stated that the recipients must provide a 20 percent local match for operating costs and an 80 percent local match for capital projects. Applicants are eligible to apply for up to three years of funding, however, grants will be awarded for only one year with up to two, one-year options. The extension of the grant into the option years will be contingent upon the performance of the project. If the performance of a particular project is not adequate to continue the grant into the option years, the applicant may reapply for funding during the next competitive selection process. The programs must improve and become more efficient in order to remain competitive.

Ms. Kochman stated that based on the recommendations, a total of \$1,268,557 out of the \$1,278,000 projected available is recommended for funding in FY 2009. Because the amount available is a projection based on estimated sales tax revenues over the course of the next fiscal year, the actual amount of funding available for FY 2009 may differ from the estimate. If the amount available for Senior Mini-Grant funding is lower than the estimated amount,

adjustments will be made to the lowest ranked project being funded or equally distributed among all successful applicants. If the actual amount available is higher than the amount apportioned, any unallocated monies will be rolled over into future funding cycles.

Ms. Kochman stated that SANDAG Board Policy No. 033, Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum, is designed to provide an incentive-based approach to encourage local jurisdictions to address the region's housing needs. Board Policy No. 033 requires that any discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG must be awarded based on compliance with an adopted housing element and the production of affordable housing, unless an exemption to the policy applies. Within Board Policy No. 033 there appears to be an inconsistency regarding the applicability of the policy to the *TransNet* Senior Mini-Grant Program. Attachment 2 of the policy lists discretionary funding programs that are subject to Board Policy No. 033, and specifically includes the *TransNet* Senior Mini-Grant Program. However, Section 2.2 of the policy describes the types of funding that are exempt from the policy, including "funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund)."

The Senior Mini-Grant Program originally was listed in Attachment 2 because at the time it was prepared, staff believed that only local jurisdictions would apply for Senior Mini-Grant funds. However, when the program guidelines were developed, it was determined that other agencies should be allowed to receive these funds. As a result, the majority of the Senior Mini-Grant funds are proposed to be awarded to agencies other than local jurisdictions, including nonprofit agencies. Based solely Section 2.2, Board Policy No. 033 would not apply to this funding program, but Attachment 2 makes the exemption unclear as to the Senior Mini-Grant funds. These inconsistencies regarding the Senior Mini-Grant Program will be resolved in a review of Board Policy No. 033 to be undertaken by the Regional Planning Committee, Executive Committee, and Board at their meetings in October. In an effort to avoid possible delays in this year's funding allocations, however, the Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board that the Senior Mini-Grant program be exempted from Board Policy No. 033 for the FY 2009 cycle.

Ms. Kochman stated that a total of 18 applications were received for 28 individual projects. The review committee scored and ranked each application to develop a list of recommended projects. The Evaluation Committee recommended funding the top 13 projects based on their scores. For this first competitive selection cycle for the Senior Mini-Grant program, there was no maximum amount set for the grant request. As a result the grant requests ranged from less than \$21,000 to more than \$320,000.

The review committee recommended that staff negotiate with the applicants requesting the three highest amounts in order to maximize the number of grants awarded. Staff met with each of these three agencies and was able to work with them to adjust their project budgets and scope and lower the grant request amount. For future Senior Mini-Grant competitive processes, staff will evaluate setting a maximum grant award amount.

Ms. Kochman stated that the review committee also was interested in funding the proposal submitted by Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT); however, the committee did raise some concerns regarding their submission. The project proposed by FACT involves using Senior Mini-Grant funds to reimburse existing transportation programs to provide trips for seniors who contact FACT but do not have any means of transportation and are not

able to afford expensive private providers. This will be a preliminary step toward the FACT vision of a countywide coordinated transportation system. By matching riders with the most appropriate available transportation option, FACT will be able to take advantage of existing excess capacity on already operating vehicles with the expectations that greater ridership will lead to lower per-trip costs and ultimately result in more economical transportation options. Staff worked with FACT to respond to the two concerns that were raised by the review committee: 1) Securing Partners. The success of the FACT project is contingent upon being able to secure partners. At the time of the submission of the original application, there was no written commitment from transportation providers to supply rides for the FACT senior clients.

After the review committee met, FACT was able to secure written agreement from the North County Transit District (NCTD) and Redwood Elderlink, a private nonprofit transportation provider, to enter into contract negotiations once FACT is awarded the grant; and 2) Non-Duplicative Scheduling Effort. The review committee was concerned that, in the FACT role of matching the rider to a provider, FACT may incur additional administrative costs over the rider contacting the provider directly. FACT submitted a letter to SANDAG as an addendum to the application explaining the process FACT will use to schedule and how it will create economies of scale as opposed to additional administrative costs. Since FACT was able to fully address the concerns raised by the review committee, staff is recommending a modification to the review committee's recommendations to include fully funding the FACT project.

Ms. Kochman stated that the review committee also reviewed an application submitted by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) for ten fixed-route services and one demand responsive service. MTS believes that these projects should be funded through this program because given the current budget issues facing MTS the routes proposed for funding may be facing service cuts which will have a negative impact on seniors throughout the region. The routes MTS is proposing to be funded through the Senior Mini-Grant program include routes that either serve many seniors, serve areas where a high concentration of seniors live, serve areas where gaps for senior transportation are identified in the Coordinated Plan, or serve hospitals or other destinations frequented by seniors. Based on the data provided by MTS in its application, seniors account for a total of 12.5 percent of the ridership on the routes proposed for funding, ranging between 7.5 percent and 20 percent on the fixed-route services in the package, and 89 percent for the demand responsive service.

The applications were reviewed and scored by an outside committee of seniors and persons involved with senior transportation and each member independently came to the same conclusion that *public transit* services are not a *specialized transportation service* as specified for funding through the Senior Mini-Grant Program in the *TransNet* Ordinance. Consequently, the review committee ranked these projects low and did not recommend them for funding. SANDAG staff concurs with the recommendations of the Review Committee, and the funding recommendation was supported by the *TransNet* Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC).

Ms. Kochman stated that Attachment 1 includes the list of 14 projects recommended to receive Senior Mini-Grant funding. Fully funding these 14 projects would result in allocating \$1,268,557 out of the \$1,278,000 estimated to become available in FY 2009. Attachment 1 also includes the amounts recommended to be funded as option years (FY 2010 and

FY 2011) for the grant. The 14 projects included in Attachment 1 were recommended for funding by a 4-2 vote by the ITOC at its July 16, 2008, meeting.

Ms. Kochman stated that on January 18, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved the competitive process and evaluation criteria for allocating FY 2008 and FY 2009 New Freedom funds (Attachment 2). A New Freedom review committee was established composed of five members including representatives of social service agencies that work closely with seniors, and representatives from MTS and Caltrans. The members of this review committee met on June 30, 2008, and scored each project against the adopted evaluation criteria and not relative to other projects. These scores were then used to rank the projects. The Federal Guidance for the New Freedom permits applicants to apply for funding appropriated to three different fiscal years at one time. However, since funding for this program is only authorized through FY 2009, the applicants only had the opportunity to apply for two years of funding at this time.

Ms. Kochman stated that for New Freedom projects, recipients must provide a 50 percent local match for operating costs, and a 20 percent local match for capital and mobility management projects. For this program all remaining funds authorized under SAFETEA-LU are recommended for funding totaling \$1,201,001 over the next two years. The amount of available funding for FY 2009 is an estimate provided by FTA. If the amount appropriated when the Federal appropriations bill is passed differs from the estimates, adjustments will be made to the lowest ranked project being funded.

Ms. Kochman stated that Attachment 1 includes the list of six projects recommended to receive New Freedom funding. These six projects recommended for funding represent the top projects based on the ranking of projects performed by the scoring committee. For FY 2008, the scoring committee is recommending these projects be funded for a total of \$531,709. Through the scoring committee process, two projects tied with the same ranking: the Accessible Paths of Travel project submitted by NCTD and the Mobility Management project submitted by FACT. There was not enough of FY 2008 money available to fully fund both of these projects. The applicants of these two projects agreed to revise their scope and budget to match the amount of funding that was available, which will provide funding to cover approximately 75 percent of both projects in FY 2008.

For FY 2009, there is a greater level of funding available than in FY 2008. This increased funding allowed the remaining FACT and NCTD project funding requests to be funded fully in FY 2009, and also allowed for partial funding of the next highest ranked project, the Accessible Tourism and Transportation Information Network project submitted by Accessible San Diego. Accessible San Diego also has revised its budget and scope to match the \$132,960 available.

Ms. Kochman stated that if the funding allocations outlined in Attachment 1 are recommended to the Board by the Transportation Committee, approval of the funding requests is scheduled for the September 26, 2008, Board of Directors meeting. Upon approval by the Board, projects will be amended to be included in the RTIP prior to submitting the New Freedom projects to the FTA for final approval and executing contracts with recipients.

Chair Madaffer requested SANDAG General Counsel to discuss the legal issues on this item and to ensure that we are in compliance with the Ordinance.

Julie Wiley, SANDAG General Counsel stated that questions were presented regarding whether certain applications were eligible to apply for the program. She stated that she looked at the legislative intent of the Ordinance. To apply legislative intent one must look at the language of the Ordinance itself. She stated that the *TransNet* Ordinance states that the "funds should be used to provide specialized transportation services for seniors focusing on innovative and cost effective approaches to providing senior transportation including but not limited to shared group services, special shuttle services, youth/volunteer services and brokerage of multijurisdictional transportation services. Based on the words "innovative" and "improved senior transportation," she stated that the intent was not to fund existing programs already receiving local funding nor was the intent to fund fixed-route services to the general public.

Ms. Wiley stated that the phrase "specialized transportation services" is not defined in the *TransNet* Ordinance and she stated that the next step was to look at common ordinary usage of that phrase. She stated that she looked at federal and state statutes to determine if the phrase had been defined elsewhere. She determined that the U.S. Code states that grants to local government authorities for this type of program are for projects that are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of elderly individuals. Based on that definition, we need to ensure that any project funded meets those requirements. The State Transportation Development Act and the Social Services Transportation Act were for specialized transportation services, mostly for para-transit services.

Ms. Wiley stated that the next step is to look at whether other rules of statutory interpretation apply and one of those is the surplusage rule. This rule states that if the interpretation of one section of the ordinance would cause another section to be considered a surplusage then you should not give it that interpretation. In this case, the *TransNet* Ordinance language breaks down the funding for the Senior Mini-Grant program. Under the Ordinance, 16.5 percent is designated for transit projects, 2.5 percent is designated for seniors, and disabled and three and one quarter percent for the Senior Mini-Grant program, with the balance funding regular transportation services. If the three and one quarter percent were available for regular transportation services those funds would be considered surplusage or superfluous.

Ms. Wiley stated that based on these statutory rules, the interpretation is that only those projects for specialized transportation services would be eligible under this program.

Chair Madaffer requested Ms. Kochman to discuss the list of project rankings and she stated that the Evaluation Committee reviewed the projects and individually ranked them one through 28. The Committee took the average of those individual rankings to determine the final rank. The recommendation is to fund the top 13 projects in addition to the 16<sup>th</sup> project for FACT based on the subsequent written agreements from FACT.

Mayor Jim Desmond (SDCRAA) requested clarification of the fiscal years being funded under the program for approval today and Ms. Kochman stated that the approval today is for FY2009 and FY2010-11 would be considered option years and funding would be based on the evaluation of the project under the performance criteria. If they are meeting the performance indicators, the projects would be funded for the option years without further approval by the Transportation Committee.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) requested clarification regarding the funding for the Senior Mini-Grant program and whether the requested amount is the recommended funding amount and Ms. Kochman confirmed that but for the New Freedom Grants the recommended amount is listed separately from the requested amount.

Clive Richard, a member of the public commented regarding the state of the current transportation system in the region. He commented that this is a principle to stand on and he does not believe the state was right in diverting transportation and transit funds to fill general fund gaps and in the same principle this agency should not divert funds that were identified to satisfy the needs of a transit operation deficit; this is not the mechanism for that.

Floyd Willis, a member of the public representing Aging and Independent Services stated that the organization participated in the preparation of The Coordinated Plan. He commented that the Plan includes two things they recommended; the voluntary driver program and the coordinated effort under FACT. He stated his support for these programs and funding for them to get seniors rides to and from the closest place to their home.

Nan Valerio, a member of the Evaluation Committee stated that the review committee was unanimous in its recommendations and its opinion that the program was intended to fund projects dedicated for seniors. She stated that MTS was not considered eligible because its programs were not specifically for seniors. She stated that the Mini-Grant program will provide rides to seniors throughout the region and funding a noneligible agency would violate the purpose of the program. She asked the Committee for support of its recommendations of projects for funding.

Chair Madaffer asked what other groups or organizations had reviewed the recommended list of projects, and Ms. Kochman stated that the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) had reviewed the recommendations and supported the list of projects for funding.

Chair Pro Tem Emery stated that as the MTS representative he felt staff did a good job explaining the purpose of the program but that in May public transportation agencies were told they were eligible to apply for funding under this program. He stated that SANDAG staff had supported the MTS application and assisted in the proposal submission. Chair Pro Tem Emery expressed his disappointment that the legal opinion was not given earlier. He stated that MTS expended staff time and effort to submit the proposal. He commented MTS would have not expended effort on this proposal and perhaps found other methods of funding some of these routes that will have to be cut. He stated that he could not support the creation of new routes for seniors at the expense of cutting current routes that support seniors. He stated that the transit agencies should not have been told they were eligible to begin with.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) asked what actions would need to be accomplished to change the language of the *TransNet* Ordinance so that these types of programs could be included in the future.

Ms. Wiley stated that to revise the program, the *TransNet* Ordinance would have to be amended. Amending the Ordinance requires a first and second reading, a two thirds vote, a notice in the paper and public review. After approval of the amended language, the

evaluation and eligibility criteria could be changed; there would then be a new call for projects, review and evaluation of the project and the rest of the process could continue. The timeline for this new call for projects would be approximately six to eight months after the Ordinance is amended.

Deputy Mayor Jerry Rindone (South County) commented the actual number of seniors served is not considered in any part of the program application. He commented that one project may serve only seniors exclusively. Another program may serve seniors plus other passengers but the actual number of seniors served is much greater than the program that serves seniors only. The program serving the greater number of seniors would not be eligible because it serves other groups. Deputy Mayor Rindone stated that when staff redevelops the criteria for the program, they need to include a component that evaluates the actual number of seniors served not just the percentage served.

Ms. Kochman stated that the performance indicators did look at the operating cost per passenger.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo stated that any proposed changes to the program would potentially change the intent of the Ordinance. He commented that he looked at an Escondido project for funding but it did not fit into the parameters of the program. Also, NCTD did not submit a proposal because it did not meet the requirements. He stated that we need to be cautious of changing the intent of the program.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) requested that the action taken today include direction to bring back changes to the program criteria for the future program years. He commented that with respect to criteria in this round, some of the program groups have exemplary records working with seniors and other groups don't have a track record with seniors. He asked whether there was any weight given to experience of the agency in working with seniors or past performance of the program.

Ms. Kochman stated that this was not specifically considered under the program but that the Evaluation Committee did discuss the experience and past performance of each group and program.

Supervisor Roberts stated that the criteria must specifically include consideration of past performance history and the commitment and credibility of the agency.

Deputy Mayor Druker stated that in terms of changing the Ordinance, we need to look in the context of the overall funding for transit. He stated that this type of funds should be used to backfill public transportation when the state is diverting funds. When transit is fully funded we can fund these types of grants. Deputy Mayor Druker stated that the Del Mar Community Connections would love to be able to provide services to other jurisdictions in the region. The agency could fund several trips to grocery stores in the City of San Diego benefiting both Del Mar and San Diego.

Councilmember Atkins stated her agreement with following legal regulations and rules but commented that we need to consider all circumstances as well. She stated that there needs to be an analysis of the actual number of seniors served. Also, staff needs to review the types of groups and determine which has more experience with serving seniors and which are long running programs. The reduction of bus services will impact seniors and we need to

look at that impact; if we fund programs for seniors but reduce other transit options seniors will be using these services to a greater degree than originally the program was designed for. These agencies could potentially be overrun by requests for services due to other service route cuts. She stated that the program needs to look at the overall impact in how the reduction of bus service will affect the intent of this program.

Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal) requested that this issue be on the agenda for discussion during the Board Retreat in January 2009 so that an in depth discussion can occur.

Chair Madaffer recommended adding to the action today criteria for the next review and analysis of the number of seniors versus the percentage of seniors served as well as consideration of the length of time the program has been in place and the experience of the agency in serving seniors.

Vice Chair Jack Dale (East County) stated that after approval of this item, funding is awarded for a three-year period, the award year plus two option years. He commented that any analysis of number of seniors served, experience or length of program, or other recommendations that may change the criteria or program eligibility should be completed prior to awarding any funds.

Chair Madaffer stated that he supports approval of the item today and award of the funds. He commented that he would recommend staff review the program for future funding cycles and incorporate the recommendations from today into future criteria.

Ms. Wiley stated that the Committee could add to the action today to include language in the grant agreements that states award of funds in option years is contingent on approval by the Transportation Committee of the performance of the grantees under any new or modified criteria.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Gallo and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors: (1) interpret Board Policy No. 033 as exempting from that Policy the FY 2009 Senior Mini-Grant projects; (2) approve funding for the list of Senior Mini-Grant and New Freedom Projects as outlined in Attachment 1; and (3) direct staff to conduct a reassessment of the evaluation criteria for the *TransNet* Senior Mini-Grant program and include a provision in the grant agreements that stipulates any funding beyond the first year may be subject to changes in the program criteria resulting from the reassessment.

Chair Madaffer opened the public hearing and explained the order of business for the hearing.

#### 4. PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 – 2012 COORDINATED PLAN (RECOMMEND)

Phil Trom, Associate Transit Service Planner presented the item and stated that SANDAG is responsible for developing a Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) each year in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RSRTP provides a five-year blueprint of how the transit concepts described in the RTP are to be implemented in the region. In addition, the federal government, through the SAFETEA-LU, requires that each region prepare a Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services

Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan). Since the RS RTP and Coordinated Plan requirements include several areas which overlap, the two documents were combined starting with the 2007 – 2011 Plan. The combined document is known as the Coordinated Plan.

Mr. Trom stated that the intent of the Coordinated Plan is to improve coordination in transportation planning and operations among public transit and human service transportation providers. As such, the development of the Coordinated Plan brings all publicly available transportation services under a single unified plan. Transportation services included in the plan are those services offered by private companies, nonprofit organizations, public transit agencies, SANDAG, and human services agencies. Given this broad approach, the Coordinated Plan represents a significant expansion of transportation planning activities conducted in the region and, as a result, brings forth a “one region – one network – one plan” concept of public transit and human services transportation planning.

The 2008 – 2012 Coordinated Plan includes the required elements of both the RS RTP and Coordinated Plan with the exception of RS RTP components involving the development of new services. To do this, SANDAG will need to have the Service Improvement Plans (SIP) from both transit operators. SIPs were not prepared by either operator this year due to lack of available funding and anticipation that the development of new service would not be feasible under the current budget constraints. However, the intent is for future Coordinated Plans to evaluate and prioritize new and revised services for implementation, along with SANDAG *TransNet* projects, such as Bus Rapid Transit, Rapid Bus and Light Rail Extensions, and include those projects in the Regional Service Implementation Plan.

Mr. Trom stated that on August 1, 2008, the Transportation Committee released the Draft Coordinated Plan for public comment through September 19, 2008. Attachment 1 summarizes the comments received up until September 2, 2008, including staff responses to the comments. The comments received were minor in nature and did not result in any changes to the main Coordinated Plan document itself. However, one comment suggested that the Technical Appendix be expanded to include additional locations where there is an identified need for social service transportation. As a result, the Technical Appendix was updated to include these additional areas.

Mr. Trom stated that the comments received were in general support of the Plan. There were requests for more detailed information on Civil Rights to be included in the Technical Appendix, for additional locations to be added to the list of areas with social service transportation deficiencies, that SANDAG think creatively about ways to solve current and future transportation problems, and that the transportation needs of Ramona residents are reconsidered.

Mr. Trom stated that no comments were received from MTS or NCTD because staff worked closely with those agencies in drafting the Plan. He stated that the only comments received after agenda production were requests that transportation needs of Ramona residents be reconsidered and comments from Move San Diego. Mr. Trom reviewed those specific comments and stated that staff has addressed these comments and a blue sheet was provided to the Committee on the proposed actions.

Mr. Trom stated that the approval of the Coordinated Plan will enable the continued distribution of federal funding under the New Freedom (transportation for persons with disabilities), Job Access and Reverse Commute ([JARC] commute transportation for

individuals with limited means), and 5310 (seniors and persons with disabilities) programs. The plan also will be used to guide the distribution of local funding under the Senior Mini-Grant program which was created through the *TransNet* Extension. New Freedom, JARC, and Senior Mini-Grant funding will be awarded through a competitive process following the plan's approval by the Board of Directors. Copies of the approved Coordinated Plan will be forwarded to Caltrans to enable it to hold the competitive process for statewide New Freedom and JARC grants in the rural areas of the San Diego region. A copy of the Final Coordinated Plan also will be forwarded to the Federal Transit Administration. Printed copies of the Technical Appendix will be available at the Transportation Committee meeting and also are available on the SANDAG web site.

Mr. Trom states that following the public hearing, the Transportation is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the final Coordinated Plan.

Carolyn Chase, Move San Diego submitted written comments and stated that the organization met with staff and are happy with the Coordinated Plan but still have concerns. These concerns were detailed in the written comments which she read into the record.

LaVonna Connelly, a member of the public stated that the recent transportation cuts to Ramona were necessary due to budget constraints but that the cuts were affecting the community negatively and cutting the FAST bus is significantly detrimental to many of the residents. Many will now be homebound because that route was cut. She also expressed that any proposed revisions for The Coordinated Plan should include Ramona and requested that SANDAG provide some advocacy assistance to Ramona residents. The Coordinated Plan must include revisions for rural area transit.

Councilmember Monroe requested Ms. Connelly introduce herself to the Interim Director for FACT who was present at the meeting and can assist her with her needs.

Julie Berry, a member of the public and a resident of Ramona commented that she is disabled and submitted written comments and questions regarding the service cuts to the Ramona area. She commented that the service cuts are affecting her and the other residents. She asked for direction from the committee on whom she could contact regarding getting answers to the questions she submitted.

Chair Madaffer directed staff to respond to her questions briefly today after public testimony and in detail at a future date either in writing or in a meeting with Ms. Berry.

Councilmember Bob Campbell (North County Inland) stated that Ms. Berry should contact Alane Haynes, who was present today. Ms. Haynes is the Disability Coordinator for NCTD and can assist Ms. Berry in her transportation needs.

Daniele DeFlooda, a member of the public and a resident of Ramona expressed her concerns regarding cutting the FAST bus route to Ramona and how it has affected her quality of life and other disabled and elderly residents in Ramona.

Evelyn Christoffersen, a member of the public expressed her concerns regarding the cuts to service to Ramona and stated that the service cuts have negatively affected her quality of life. She requested advocacy for Ramona citizens and their rural transportation needs.

Chair Madaffer closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Campbell commented that the public comments today reflected the same heard at a recent public hearing in Escondido. NCTD made some adjustment in routes to provide some economy of service. He stated that NCTD will continue to look at adjustments to provide a continuity service and that FACT will also take the opportunity to infill the reduction in fixed routes.

Chair Madaffer stated that the state has raided \$1.2 billion in transportation funds and no one on this committee wants to make these cuts. The affect on the public is heart wrenching. He stated that he handed out a list of our federal and state delegates to members of the public today and requested they contact these representatives regarding the need for funds for transit for the state and the region. Chair Madaffer commented that the cuts to funding for public transportation are not acceptable. He commented that in 2010 we are planning for a ballot initiative for quality of life and it addresses transit and transit funding. The decisions we make to cut service are brought upon us because of the funding cuts from the state.

Councilmember Atkins stated that she would like to have staff to respond to Ms. Chases' comments today regarding Policy 18 and the questions submitted by Ms. Berry. She stated that the policy documents should include Ramona and address the transit issues there. Councilmember Atkins stated that the state and federal delegates need to listen to the public comments and hear first hand how the raid on public transportation funds is affecting their constituents. She stated that this Committee should invite the legislative delegation to attend a public hearing. Councilmember Atkins stated that the policy documents should reflect the real deficiencies so that we can address and fix what is wrong.

Dave Schumacher, Principle Regional Planner responded to Ms. Chase's comments regarding Board Policy 18 and stated that the Policy addresses projected improvements to services and prioritization of those improvements over the 5 years of the Plan. SANDAG will work with the operators to include the service improvements in The Coordinated Plan. Currently there are no improvements planned because of the current financial situation. Basically there were no improvements submitted by the operators because we are trying to just hold on to what we have. We do have *TransNet* projects projected to come on line in the next 5 years and those will be included in the Coordinated Plan. He stated that staff will meet with the Ramona residents to address their concerns directly. Mr. Schumacher stated that we will develop guidelines for lifeline services for these rural areas. We will work with the transit agencies to develop these guidelines.

Chairman Gallo stated that our tax funds should be dedicated to public transit. Unfortunately the state raided those funds. The public needs to understand that SANDAG and the transit agencies are forced to deal with how that affects our services. He stated that people have an expectation of continued transportation services. Our focus needs to be on finding funding to support transit services. NCTD was able to restore lifeline service to Ramona. SANDAG needs to support FACT and get the funding for this service. This is the service that can support the rural areas.

Chair Pro Tem Emery stated that SANDAG needs to place a higher priority on developing and enhancing volunteer driver programs. He stated that increasing ridership is important

and in order to improve ridership bus stops need to be accommodating, clean and safe, and afford weather and shade protection. He stated that projects for improvements to bus stops also need to have a higher priority.

Councilmember Monroe stated that FACT should have a higher priority as well and Mr. Trom stated that FACT was already a higher priority because mobility and ride-sharing programs are a higher priority and FACT would be included in that priority.

Deputy Mayor Rindone suggested that any hearing that included the elected delegation should be held after the November election to include the newly elected officials.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Emery, and a second by Councilmember Hall, the Transportation Committee conducted a public hearing on the 2008 – 2012 Coordinated Plan and after considering public comments, recommended that the Board of Directors approve the final plan, as shown in Attachment 2.

6. JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPROVE)

Ms. Kochman presented the item and stated that SANDAG was selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom federal funding programs for the San Diego urbanized area. The responsibilities with this designation include developing the evaluation criteria and competitive selection process, holding the competitive selection process, and recommending to the FTA which projects should be funded.

Ms. Kochman stated that it is a federal requirement that all projects to be funded by the JARC program must be derived from the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Plan (Coordinated Plan). The evaluation criteria that were used for the JARC and New Freedom Competitive Process in 2007 were approved by the Transportation Committee on August 3, 2007. This approval was prior to the development to the latest update to the Coordinated Plan which was prepared to comply with federal regulations, requiring priorities for funding and implementation. On August 1, 2008, staff proposed an update to the JARC evaluation criteria to incorporate the new content in the Coordinated Plan.

Ms. Kochman provided background information on the evolution of the JARC criteria throughout the period that SANDAG has been the designated recipient for the San Diego urbanized area. The original evaluation criteria developed by SANDAG were adapted from the evaluation criteria developed by Caltrans for its rural and small community JARC program. The SANDAG revisions included adding a criterion for “innovation.” The SANDAG Coordinated Plan Ad Hoc Group composed of representatives of the public, social service transportation providers, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), and the transit operators, provided feedback, and ultimately supported the criteria that were presented to and approved by the Transportation Committee. After each competitive selection cycle, adjustments have been made to the evaluation criteria and their weighting to respond to lessons learned and comments made by the Transportation Committee. Additional adjustments have also been made to respond to any new federal requirements. This evolution resulted in the evaluation criteria presented to the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008, which included seven individual criteria whose total scoring add to 100 points.

Ms. Kochman stated that in order to develop the additional alternatives for the Transportation Committee, a stakeholder ad hoc group was created, composed of representatives from the MTS, the NCTD, Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT), and the International Rescue Committee (IRC). The IRC is a social service agency that provides resettlement services, including transportation for refugees to participate in job training and job searching activities and has expressed interest in applying for JARC funding in the future.

This ad hoc group met on August 19, 2008, and reviewed research done by staff on evaluation criteria used by 20 different agencies across the nation. Through the process of examining the many different criteria used in other jurisdictions, the ad hoc group provided staff with input regarding the development of the alternatives. One of the most difficult challenges in developing a set of evaluation criteria is that a single set of criteria must be used to evaluate and recommend projects as diverse as operations, capital, or planning services. The input from the ad hoc group, along with the feedback given at the August 1, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, was used to develop three alternatives. Once the three alternatives were developed, they were distributed back to the ad hoc group for additional comment.

Ms. Kochman stated that the first alternative would allow any project derived from the Coordinated Plan to be eligible regardless of its priority ranking, with projects eligible to receive up to 20 points in this category if derived from a very high priority. This alternative is very similar to the criteria presented to the Transportation Committee on August 1, 2008; however, the weightings of the criteria are redistributed based on the input received from the Transportation Committee. The "Program Effectiveness & Performance Indicators" criterion weighting was increased from 10 to 20 points and the "Innovation" criterion was increased from 5 to 10 points. In order to accommodate these increased weightings, the "Implementation Plan," "Financial and Environmental Sustainability," and "Project Budget" criteria's weighting were each reduced by 5 points. Additionally, the "Coordination and Program Outreach" criterion is split into two separate criteria based on the suggestion by the ad hoc stakeholder group.

Ms. Kochman stated that the second alternative eliminates the "Coordinated Plan Priority" as a project evaluation criterion and turns it into an eligibility requirement, only allowing projects to apply if they are derived from either the very high priority or high priority lists in the Coordinated Plan. The 20 points that were previously allocated to the "Coordinated Plan Priority" criteria are then redistributed among some of the other criteria in this alternative, increasing the weightings of "Program Effectiveness & Performance Indicators" by 10 points, "Innovation" by 5 points, and "Goals and Objectives" by 5 points.

Ms. Kochman stated that the third alternative is similar to Alternative 2 requiring projects to be derived from either a very high or high priority list in the Coordinated Plan in order to be eligible for funding. This alternative takes the evaluation process a step further by dividing each criterion further into five point sub-criteria. Evaluating the proposals against these smaller scoring increments would require a greater focus on all the various aspects within each criterion.

Ms. Kochman stated provided examples of high priorities for projects and stated that Alternative 3 is recommended for adoption because it lays out the evaluation criteria more definitively, ensuring that the Evaluation Committee evaluates all aspects of the proposals.

While each member of the ad hoc stakeholder group initially had a different preferred alternative, subsequent discussions led to general support for Alternative 3 among all members.

Ms. Kochman reviewed the proposed schedule for the competitive process and grant award for the fall competitive cycle of FY 2008 JARC funding.

Harry Mathis, Chairman (MTS) requested staff to clarify the total amount of funding for the program and Ms. Kochman stated that currently there is \$210,000 available. She stated that there is a grant pending with MTS for rural JARC funding that could increase those funds by another \$150,000.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Druker and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee approved the evaluation criteria outlined in Alternative 3 in Attachment 1 for the JARC Grant Program fall 2008 competitive process.

7. CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET TRANSFER (APPROVE)

SANDAG implements projects for the MTS that require construction contracting. These projects are included in the SANDAG Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Program Budget. SANDAG policy requires Transportation Committee approval for budget transfers in amounts between \$100,000 and \$500,000 cumulative. The MOU being recommended for approval between MTS and SANDAG outlining the scope and cost of the project and the fund transfer summary were provided in the staff report.

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Dale and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee approved a Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Transit System for a fund transfer in an amount not to exceed \$150,000, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1, and approve a new capital project for these funds. The new project would demolish the existing El Cajon Transit Center building and replace the building with bus platform paving.

8. SORRENTO VALLEY COASTER CONNECTION UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Mr. Schumacher presented the item and stated that the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection (SVCC) is an MTS-operated service that provides short distance shuttle connections on nine routes between the Sorrento Valley COASTER station and businesses in Sorrento Valley, Sorrento Mesa, Carroll Canyon, University City, and Torrey Pines, serving about 900 to 1,000 passengers each day. Previously, nearly 70 percent of the annual costs to operate SVCC services were subsidized by funds from the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and Interstate 805 (I-805)/I-5 construction mitigation funds from Caltrans. Neither of these funding sources, which totaled nearly \$732,000 in FY 2008, is available after July 1, 2008.

Mr. Schumacher stated that in order to help make up for the loss of these revenues, the Board of Directors at its June 13, 2008, meeting approved charging a fare for all SVCC passengers (previously, passengers were allowed to transfer free of charge from the COASTER to the COASTER Connection). Effective September 1, 2008, a one-way fare of \$1.00 (\$0.50 Seniors/Disabled/Medicare) is now charged; a \$40.00 monthly SVCC pass also is available (\$10.00 Seniors/Disabled/Medicare, \$20.00 youth) per month. Regional and

Premium passes are accepted; however, COASTER passes are not accepted. SANDAG has projected that the new fare will cover about 25 percent of the operating costs of the SVCC.

Mr. Schumacher stated that even with the fare implementation, additional funding sources will be needed to ensure long-term operation of SVCC services. Mr. Schumacher presented the current funding for the SVCC, along with a status report on current efforts to develop longer-term funding through public-private partnerships and development of other possible service options. MTS indicates that the FY 2009 cost to operate the SVCC services is \$1.05 million. Current revenues to fund the services total \$627,000. MTS staff reported to its Board of Directors on August 21, 2008, that it believes it has enough funding identified to continue operating all nine SVCC until the third quarter of FY 2009. Additional funds will be needed to ensure continued SVCC services beyond the third quarter.

Mr. Schumacher stated that three significant initiatives are currently underway to preserve linkages between the Sorrento Valley COASTER station and job sites. First, MTS, in conjunction with Move San Diego, a nonprofit agency, has been meeting with employers to identify service that would be viable with employer financial participation. The result could be a network of routes that is less comprehensive in terms of service coverage depending on employer participation, but one that would provide long-term financial sustainability for those services that remain. While no agreements have been finalized, and continuation of all the nine SVCC routes remains questionable, potential interest has been expressed.

Sharon Cooney, Director of Government Affairs and Community Relations (MTS) briefed the committee on the status of the actions taken by MTS with the employers in the area and the status of any agreements for funding.

Mr. Schumacher stated that four of the current SVCC routes do not serve areas where major employers are located, and so the ability to secure public-private partnerships is doubtful. SANDAG RideLink staff is investigating the feasibility of offering short distance vanpools to serve job sites where public-private partnerships are not likely to occur. A RideLink consultant is making contact with smaller employers in the areas now served by the SVCC to assess the feasibility of shifting rides to vanpools.

Lastly, SANDAG currently has about \$150,000 available in federal JARC funding for which the SVCC-type services are eligible. This money can be awarded only through a competitive process and a competition is anticipated to be held this fall. An additional \$180,000 may be available for the competitive process if a grant application to Caltrans for rural JARC funds is approved.

Mr. Schumacher stated that he would report back to Transportation Committee on new developments as they occur.

Mr. Jablonski added that some employers are expanding their own shuttle services to fill in the gaps and that has greatly helped with the situation.

Mayor Druker stated many of the employers in the area are small and it is difficult to get these small employers to agree to participate in discussions on a public-private partnership to provide these types of shuttle services but we need to continue to push for their participation.

Mayor Desmond asked whether any services to Sorrento Valley had been cut yet. Staff responded that all the shuttle services were still running.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

9. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM, AND THE CITIES OF DEL MAR, EL CAJON, ESCONDIDO, LEMON GROVE, NATIONAL CITY, POWAY, SAN DIEGO, SAN MARCOS, SANTEE, SOLANA BEACH, AND VISTA (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2009-04, as shown in Attachment 1, approving revisions to TDA Article 3.0 claims for various County of San Diego and Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista completed bicycle and pedestrian projects; and TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 for the Metropolitan Transit System.

Councilmember Monroe asked staff to explain why funds for bicycle programs were being cut or decreased.

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Associate Financial Analyst responded that funds are not being cut. She stated that SANDAG undertakes a review of bicycle and pedestrian projects funded under Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3.0 programs. The purpose of the review is to identify projects that have been completed by the sponsoring agency. The review has been completed for all projects. After a final accounting, unexpended funds from the County of San Diego and the Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista projects remain, and the allocations for these TDA claims must be reduced.

Mayor Desmond stated that the map shows the bike lane over Lake Hodges stopping in the middle of the Lake and asked what the status was for that bike lane. Staff clarified that the project was overall on schedule but was on hold waiting for the environmental breeding season to end of some bird species in the area.

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Dale and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee approved Resolution No. 2009-04, approving revisions to TDA Article 3.0 claims for various County of San Diego and Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista completed bicycle and pedestrian projects; and TDA Article 4.0 Claim No. 08031000 for the Metropolitan Transit System.

10. AGREEMENT WITH CALTRANS FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING ON THE INTERSTATE 5/STATE ROUTE 56 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (RECOMMEND)

Richard Chavez, Principal Engineer presented the item. Caltrans has asked to use SANDAG on-call engineering consultants up to \$1 million for preliminary engineering for the I-5/SR 56 Interchange Improvement project. The cost is estimated at \$830,000. *TransNet* funds would be used to front the costs. These costs would be reimbursed by Caltrans. There are currently no *TransNet* funds for the I-5/SR 56 project.

Mr. Chavez stated that the I-5/SR 56 Interchange improvement project is a *TransNet* project. However, this project is not included in the Early Action Program (EAP) and is therefore not covered by the Master Agreement between SANDAG and Caltrans. The Master Agreement, among other things, allows Caltrans to utilize SANDAG on-call engineering consultants.

Caltrans is requesting the execution of an agreement that would allow Caltrans to use SANDAG on-call engineering consultants for preliminary engineering necessary for the I-5/SR 56 Interchange improvement project. A project alternative includes the construction of the missing south to east and west to north connectors. The current cost estimate for the project alternative that includes the construction of the missing connectors is \$150 million. Current funding on the project totals \$9.5 million and includes a combination of federal demonstration grant funds, state funds, and funding from the City of San Diego. There are no *TransNet* funds on the project currently. The draft environmental document is scheduled for release to the public in summer 2009.

Mr. Chavez stated that SANDAG has recently executed engineering consultant contracts totaling \$175 million and has the capacity to accommodate Caltrans request. SANDAG administrative costs will be minimal and will be fully reimbursed by Caltrans within 25 days. He commented that ITOC recommended approval but that no other agreements be entered into until this agreement was fully reimbursed.

Chair Madaffer asked for staff to clarify the timeline for reimbursement and Allan Kossup, Corridor Director stated that the agreement was for 30-day reimbursement.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director commented that SANDAG has worked closely with Caltrans on the impact of how its budget issues would affect its capacity for on-call consultants. Caltrans had funding for September and October but after that budget issues may again affect its ability to fund projects. He stated that staff could be back in October to brief the committee on this issue.

Mayor Druker commented that there is some controversy with this project and wanted the committee to understand that there is controversy in how the project will affect the homes along that freeway.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to sign an agreement with Caltrans for preliminary engineering for the Interstate 5/State Route 56 Interchange improvement project. The agreement would allow Caltrans to utilize the SANDAG on-call engineering consultants. The agreement would be in substantially the same form as Attachment 1.

11. DRAFT 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (ACCEPT FOR DISTRIBUTION)

Heather Werdick, Senior Regional Planner presented the item and stated that SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region's transportation system, develop strategies to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. The last CMP update was adopted by SANDAG in 2006. At its March 21, 2008, meeting, the Transportation Committee confirmed the approach for the 2008 CMP Update and directed staff to evaluate alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements for future updates. The 2008 CMP

Update incorporates the results of new 2007 roadway and transit monitoring. In addition, an analysis of the 2030 RTP improvements on future roadway congestion is included.

Ms. Werdick stated that in order to meet state legislative requirements, the CMP provides: (1) ongoing monitoring of the region's transportation system; (2) a program to evaluate and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development projects; (3) a number of congestion management strategies to mitigate congestion; and (4) a mechanism to prepare deficiency plans for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP Level of Service standard (LOS E).

Ms. Werdick stated that the focus of the 2008 CMP Update is to provide an updated CMP roadway network Level of Service (LOS) analysis based on 2007 traffic data; an updated CMP transit corridor analysis based on 2007 transit data; and an analysis of the effect of 2030 RTP improvements on the deficient segments identified in this CMP update.

Ms. Werdick presented information on the updated CMP roadway network LOS analysis. She stated that using 2007 traffic data, a CMP LOS analysis was prepared for the CMP roadway system (Chapter 2) consisting of all state freeways, highways, and select principal arterials. LOS is a measure used to evaluate how well a roadway section or intersection operates. LOS is commonly described in letter form ranging from LOS A (least congested) to LOS F (most congested). Attachment 1 illustrates the results of the LOS analysis. The CMP standard is LOS E. Roadway segments not meeting this standard will require a deficiency plan analysis. Based upon the 2007 data, there is a decrease of 15 deficient freeway and conventional highway segments equaling a decrease in deficient mileage of almost 51 miles compared to the 2006 CMP Update. For CMP arterials, there also has been a decrease of 12 deficient segments with deficient mileage declining by almost 16 miles.

Ms. Werdick stated that the updated CMP Transit Corridor Analysis includes an analysis of existing transit service in 11 CMP transit corridors based on 2007 data (Chapter 3). The corridors were evaluated in terms of miles of service provided, number of trips operated, ridership, and average bus speed. A summary of the transit corridor analysis is included as Attachment 2. Unlike the roadway analysis, there is no adopted CMP performance standard for transit services. Between 2005 and 2007, there has been an overall 12.8 percent increase in the number of trips operated, a 9.2 percent increase in ridership, and a 0.8 percent decrease in average vehicle speed. When compared to the prior CMP analysis, which was based on 2005 data, there has been a general increase in transit ridership in North County north-south and east-west corridors. For example, the I-5 North Corridor has seen a 14.8 percent increase in ridership.

Ms. Werdick stated that an analysis of CMP-identified roadway deficiencies (segments with LOS F) was conducted to assess the impacts of recommended improvements contained within the 2030 RTP on roadway congestion. The results of this analysis and remaining deficient roadway segments that still require Deficiency Plans were summarized and presented in the staff report. Ms. Werdick stated that as this analysis shows, even with the planned 2030 RTP improvements, there will still be congestion in the future in some corridors. Population and employment growth coupled with future changes in land use and additional planned development make tackling congestion a challenge that needs to continue to be addressed. She stated that there are 21 segments that remain deficient and will require Deficiency Plans and reviewed those segments.

Ms. Werdick stated that under state law, the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions in which the deficiency occurs are responsible for the preparation of Deficiency Plans. The purpose of a Deficiency Plan is to evaluate the cause of the existing roadway deficiency and to propose remedial actions necessary to address the deficiency. As previously discussed, the initial deficiency plan requirements are met through the RTP deficiency analysis. For those remaining deficient roadway segments, SANDAG and Caltrans are available to assist local agencies in preparing individual deficiency plans.

SANDAG, Caltrans, and local jurisdictions are working on a number of subregional and corridor studies that may lay the groundwork for specific Deficiency Plans. Corridor System Management Plans are underway for the I-5 North and I-805 Corridors. Upcoming planning efforts include the I-5 South and the I-8 Corridors. Additional travel demand modeling to evaluate the cause of the deficiency also may help address the requirements of Deficiency Plans. SANDAG staff in collaboration with local jurisdictions will develop additional implementation strategies for preparing Deficiency Plans that will be proposed as part of the Fiscal Year 2010 budget process.

Ms. Werdick presented two options for future CMP updates. First, future updates could use the streamlined CMP approach. The basic state legislative requirements of the CMP are to monitor the performance of our transportation system, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. Since 1991, SANDAG has addressed these requirements through a CMP document that is updated biennially. Since the legislative requirements also are being addressed through other SANDAG monitoring and planning activities, it is no longer necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future.

One viable option for streamlining the CMP monitoring and reporting process would be to incorporate it into the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report. The RCP Annual Monitoring Report already includes CMP deficiency analysis information, and could be expanded to include the other information that is required to be reported for the CMP. There is also an established public review process for the RCP Annual Monitoring Report, which could serve as the public review process for the CMP as well.

Another option would be to continue to produce a separate CMP document every other year, but to reduce the contents of the document. Staff currently incorporates detailed information regarding the overall toolkit for CMP implementation in each report, along with details regarding the applicable legislation and other relevant background information. This material could be made available on the SANDAG website, and the CMP report itself could be shortened to include only the monitoring results and a status report on deficiency plans.

Ms. Werdick stated that at its March 21, 2008, meeting, the Transportation Committee requested that SANDAG staff evaluate whether additional arterials should be added to the CMP network. Ms. Werdick reviewed the criteria that were developed and discussed with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to conduct this evaluation. Currently, there are 11 CMP arterial corridors that are included in the 2008 CMP Update. The criteria are that the arterial must be included in the Regional Arterial System, the arterial must be classified as a principal or prime arterial in the local jurisdiction's circulation element/general plan, the arterial must carry a high volume of traffic (at least 50,000 average daily traffic), the arterial

is not near an existing CMP facility (within two miles or within one mile if the arterial has regional transit), and the arterial provides connectivity and regional coverage to the CMP network.

Ms. Werdick stated that based on these criteria, staff proposes adding the following arterials to the CMP network: Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road: I-805 to SR 125 (City of Chula Vista), and Mira Mesa Boulevard: I-805 to I-15 (City of San Diego). She stated that the City of Chula Vista staff concurs with SANDAG staff on the proposed addition of Telegraph Canyon Road. However, the City of San Diego staff disagrees with the SANDAG staff recommendation and does not support adding Mira Mesa Boulevard to the CMP network. While we acknowledge that adding Mira Mesa Boulevard to the network of CMP arterials will result in additional planning requirements, SANDAG staff believes that it would be valuable to monitor the performance of Mira Mesa Boulevard due to its significance as a major east-west arterial as well as its future significance as a regional "Bus Rapid Transit" corridor. Therefore, we recommend that both Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road and Mira Mesa Boulevard be added to the CMP network and be shown in Table 2.3 in the final 2008 CMP update. New CMP arterials would be required to participate in biennial roadway monitoring and would be subject to the deficiency plan requirements if found deficient.

Ms. Werdick presented the next steps and stated that pending Transportation Committee action, a public hearing will be held at the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting to receive comments on the 2008 CMP Update. The Transportation Committee also will be asked to adopt the 2008 CMP Update at its November 7, 2008, meeting.

Linda Marabian, City of San Diego Senior Traffic Engineer stated the City's support of the CMP but that the City had several recommended modifications to the CMP which she expressed. She reiterated the City's position that Mira Mesa Boulevard should not be added to the network of CMP arterials.

Deputy Mayor Rindone commented that the City of Chula Vista supports staff recommendation to include Telegraph Canyon Road into the CMP arterials.

Mayor Druker asked whether the congestion reflected on page 8 of the staff report reflects what will be after the 2030 RTP is implemented and staff concurred. He stated that the congestion between I-805 and SR 52 is very heavy in the evenings and the traffic on I-5 at Via de la Valle is uncongested due to the recent improvements that have been made. He commented that we should have more updated data based on these changes and improvements. The Sorrento Valley access was poorly planned and we need to address the transportation issues for that area.

Councilmember Monroe commented that slide 5 of the staff presentation reflected 2007 traffic data and stated that things have improved since 2007 with fewer vehicle miles traveled. He stated that the current situation would affect the CMP and that data should be included.

Ms. Werdick stated that most data was 2007 but some was collected from early 2008 and the CMP does reflect the changes based on that early 2008 data.

Councilmember Monroe asked whether the overall increase in number of trips and ridership for the transit corridors was for vehicle trips and asked how staff determined that change in ridership for transit vehicle trips.

Ms. Werdick stated that staff attempted to make the best comparison possible when comparing 2007 to 2005 data. She stated that many transit route changes had been made, some due to the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) which affects the number of transit vehicle miles. She stated that specific route information was included in the report. Staff looks at the average number of trips and some routes increased, some decreased and some routes were cut.

Chair Pro Tem Emery stated his support for inclusion of Mira Mesa Boulevard in the CMP arterials.

Mayor Desmond commented that staff addressed the issue of not applying the CMP in smart growth areas and asked staff to clarify the reasoning behind that decision.

Ms. Werdick stated that SANDAG staff did not feel it was appropriate to have smart growth areas as a criterion because many of the existing arterials are in or adjacent to smart growth areas and staff did not feel it was appropriate to have a requirement for future additions to the CMP that the existing arterials could not meet.

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Dale and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee accepted for distribution the Draft 2008 CMP Update for a 30-day public comment period and scheduled a public hearing for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. The Transportation Committee will be asked to adopt the 2008 CMP Update at the November 7, 2008, meeting. Additionally, the Transportation Committee is asked to provide direction regarding options to be considered for future CMP updates and discuss potential future additions to the CMP arterial network.

## 12. STATUS REPORT ON MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT (INFORMATION)

Miriam Kirshner, Senior Regional Planner presented the information item on the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project. The project is moving forward and reaching critical milestones. The Mid-City Rapid corridor connects downtown San Diego and San Diego State University via Park and El Cajon Boulevards. We have been focusing our attention on the middle segment of the corridor, including El Cajon Boulevard and the northern portion of Park Boulevard.

We have conducted the work in two phases. In the first phase, we prepared preliminary engineering design plans for northern Park Boulevard and El Cajon Boulevard to Fairmount Avenue, including the design of seven stations; we developed a prototype shelter design and station layout; we completed a transit signal priority technology study; and we prepared ridership projections and cost estimates. In the second phase, we submitted an application for federal funds to the FTA; completed preliminary engineering designs on three additional El Cajon Boulevard stations; refined the Park Boulevard design; prepared a transit signal priority inventory and procurement plan, updated the ridership projections and cost estimates; prepared a traffic study, and released a draft environmental document.

At the Board's direction, last fall we submitted an application to the FTA for funding under the Very Small Starts program. We requested a 50 percent federal share of a \$43 million

project. The project has been accepted into the federal program and \$21 million is included in the president's proposed budget for next year. We will need to maintain cost control over the project as we complete final design plans, in order to ensure that we remain eligible for the program.

Ms. Kirshner stated that the preliminary engineering design has now been completed for the middle segment of the corridor (extending from Park Boulevard/University Avenue to College Avenue/El Cajon Boulevard), which is the subject of the federal grant. Ms. Kirshner briefed in detail the status of these plans, including the station design, completion of an inventory of signal equipment and needs; inclusion of bus storage pockets on El Cajon Boulevard; refinement of the Park Boulevard segment, and the MTS bus procurement efforts.

A series of public meetings was held on the project. Four meetings to review station plans were held at hosting businesses. These four meetings were geared to adjacent business and property owners. In addition, a community-wide open house was held for community planning group members and the general public to review and comment on the project as a whole.

Ms. Kirshner stated that a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared for the project and now is being circulated for public review; the public review period is September 2, 2008, through October 3, 2008. The draft MND analyzes potential project impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, hazardous materials, noise, aesthetics, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, transportation, and utilities. There are mitigation measures for construction-related impacts related to noise, air quality, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. After mitigation, there are no remaining significant environmental impacts. The project's impacts to on-street parking are considered not significant environmentally; however, staff would continue to refine the station designs to further reduce parking impacts throughout the final design process and will return to the Transportation Committee later this fall to request adoption of the MND.

During final design, the several activities will occur. We will refine the station plans to reflect community input, develop a shelter design, update the bus branding scheme, develop landscape maintenance agreements, work on Memoranda of Understanding with the City of San Diego and MTS on signal maintenance and route operations; develop detailed signal timing plans, and continuously refine the cost estimates. We plan to complete final design plans in 2009, begin construction in 2010, and operate the route beginning in 2011.

Supervisor Roberts commented that the Mid-City Rapid project will be appreciated when completed but expressed his concerns for the record that branding is being overused. A simple system to differentiate local from Rapid buses should be sufficient. He also suggested that in some cases, the local and rapid bus station could be combined to reduce confusion, facilitate transfer, and save curb space. The stations should be evaluated prior to final design to see where combining the stations might work. He stated that the proposed pop-out design should work since El Cajon Boulevard has several lanes of traffic in each direction.

Councilmember Atkins expressed her appreciation to the staff for their work on the project and addressing the concerns of the community. She stated that the Mid-City BRT is a good

link for fast east/west service. Councilmember Atkins stated her concurrence with Supervisor Roberts' comment to combine as many of the bus stops on the route as possible while still giving the message that this stop also is a fast track stop. She commented that it is nice to create improved bus stops like the Super Loop.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning stated that staff met with Supervisor Roberts on the stations and staff is now looking at opportunities to combine the stations along this route with others that serve the Mid-City area.

Mr. Mathis stated his concern regarding the branding of buses for the several planned rapid bus projects, including Mid-City Rapid. Branding the buses will limit the use of those buses if they were needed for a different route. The buses should be branded as an MTS bus so the public will know what service they are using and use either marquees or temporary magnetic logos on the buses to identify the specific route.

Chair Madaffer expressed his support for the project and the work completed to date.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

13. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (INFORMATION)

Jim Linthicum, Division Director presented the item. He stated the Mainline contractor continues with landscape maintenance and punch list work. The contractor believes all work should be complete within a month. The deployable fall protection plates on the eastbound Escondido Avenue Station platform gangways are complete and have been inspected by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Written approval from the CPUC to open the platform was received on September 10, and service there started on September 12. The Inland Rail Trail work is complete except for punch list work. Operations and maintenance agreements are currently being negotiated with the Cities of Escondido and San Marcos. After taking a dip in mid-summer, ridership is again increasing. Daily boardings have risen from 6,962 in early August to 7,625 in late August. Ridership is expected to increase further with the start of school and the opening of the eastbound platform at Escondido Avenue.

Mr. Linthicum stated that there was nothing new to report regarding the outstanding claims and disputes. Mr. Linthicum stated that the August estimate at completion (EAC) was reduced by \$200,000 to \$479.1 million. The \$479.1 million includes a \$6.5 million contingency and assumes NCTD will pay the maximum potential value of the settlement agreement with the Mainline contractor. It also includes a forecasted cost for all change orders yet to be negotiated. The project budget set by the NCTD Board and included in the Amended Recovery Plan for the FTA is \$484.1 million, giving NCTD an additional \$5 million of capacity between budget and EAC. The current EAC includes the cost of the additional stormwater control measures put in place earlier this year. It also assumes increases in cost of construction management, insurance, and permitting.

Mr. Linthicum stated that current risks to budget lie just with the Mainline contract. Final cost is now dependent on how the issues described above are resolved and whether new claims are submitted later this year. In addition to the claims, the cost to analyze, negotiate and defend any claim also must be considered as a risk to budget.

Mr. Linthicum stated that on September 1, the NCTD employees working on the SPRINTER transitioned to SANDAG in accordance with Senate Bill 1703. Their current work assignments have not changed and for SPRINTER matters they will continue to work under the direction of the NCTD Board and management.

Councilmember Campbell commented that the Escondido Avenue Station was being confused with the Escondido Transit Center thus was being renamed Civic Center Drive Station.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for October 17, 2008, at 9 a.m. Chair Madaffer stated the October 3, 2008, meeting is cancelled.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the federal government just announced the selection of our Otay Mesa East Port of Entry project for priority funding under the Border Congestion Management program.

Councilmember Monroe asked Mr. Gallegos to pass on to staff his appreciation for the well prepared and presented reports for today's meeting.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 19, 2008**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING
North County Coastal	City of Carlsbad	Matt Hall	Member	Yes
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	Yes
North County Inland	City of Escondido	Lori Holt Pfeiler	Member	Yes
	City of Vista	Bob Campbell	Alternate	Yes
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale (Vice Chair)	Member	Yes
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	No
South County	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Member	Yes
	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Alternate	Yes
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer (Chair)	Member	Yes
	----	Toni Atkins	Alternate	Yes
	----	Ben Hueso	Alternate	No
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes
	----	Greg Cox	Alternate	No
	----	Bill Horn	Alternate	No
Metropolitan Transit System	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes
	MTS	Harry Mathis	Alternate	Yes
North County Transit District		Ed Gallo	Member	Yes
		Jerome Stocks	Alternate	No
		Chris Orlando	Alternate	No
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority		Charlene Zettel	Member	No
		Jim Desmond	Alternate	Yes
		Ramona Finnilla	Alternate	No
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	No
	---	Bill Figge	Alternate	Yes
SCTCA	---	Albert Phoenix	Member	Yes
		Shane Chapparosa	Alternate	No