

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF OCTOBER 17, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Jack Dale (East County) at 9:02 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the September 19, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public stated that he attended a recent meeting of the Sports Council and the Hall of Champions where Proposition B was discussed and the discussion was in opposition to the Proposition. Mr. Schmidt stated that he spoke with a member of the organization backing the Proposition, San Diego Community Solutions, and asked the number of members of the organization, which is only composed of two members, and why the organization did not send someone to address the Board of Directors when the Board took action on Proposition B, and the gentlemen stated that no one invited them to the meeting.

Clive Richard, a member of the public spoke regarding the state of public transportation in the region. He expressed support for a property tax to fund transportation instead of sales tax. Mr. Richard commented on the two types of transit in the region, bus and rail. He stated that his concern is the connectivity of transit in the region not what transit agency operates it. He stated that we should talk about consolidation of modes of transit not transit agencies.

Lorraine Leighton, a member of the public stated that she visited the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) convention and commented that she noticed several delegates walked in front of the moving trolley. Also, in Old Town she has noticed several people trespassing and walking on the tracks and crossing in front of the trolley. When she asked the security officer why he was not writing tickets, the officer told her he did not want to waste a day in court.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) stated that MTS officers have written 273 violations for trespassing during the first six months of 2008.

CONSENT ITEMS

3. CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California's major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor the work on the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) stated that High Speed Rail was discussed at the recent League of California Cities Annual Conference. At this meeting, it was not confirmed whether the high speed rail route would continue to San Diego from Los Angeles but the report today reflects the route continuing into San Diego and requested clarification regarding recent changes that occurred in the legislation.

Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director stated that the original ballot measure required the San Francisco to Los Angeles route to be completed prior to allocating any bond funds to another piece of the route. Assemblymember Galgiani introduced a bill that requires financial accountability. The bill allows for the High Speed Rail Authority to make findings that as long as there is no adverse impact to the construction of the San Francisco to Los Angeles route, bond funds could be used for other segments. The bill also provides for oversight and accountability by requiring the High Speed Rail Authority to produce a business plan. The new language allows our region to be more competitive for these bond funds. Our region does need to move forward more quickly now. We have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the High Speed Rail Authority and our next steps will be assigning tasks to move the project forward.

4. LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY BOARD MEETING REPORT (INFORMATION)

The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak's fastest growing. The report summarizes the actions from the LOSSAN Board meeting on January 10, 2007.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Lori Holt-Pfeiler (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Hall, the Transportation Committee accepted Consent Items 3 through 4.

CHAIR'S REPORTS

5. STATE ROUTE (SR) 905/11 STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Vice Chair Dale introduced the item and Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director provided the monthly update of discussion by the State Route 905 strike team and the status of the SR 11 project.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that the legislation for SR 11 was signed and SANDAG is now the tolling authority for the project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) nominated SR 11 as one of its transportation border relief programs so we can tap into the expertise of the FHWA for technical advice and financial support. Also, on October 3, 2008, a record of decision was signed that clears the way for the Presidential Permit, which should be issued by the end of this month. He stated that he and Mr. Gallegos will be meeting with Mexican government officials to discuss a bi-national financing plan for the new border crossing. This would lead the way for a unitary tolling system for both the U.S. and Mexican sides of the new POE.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that construction is underway on the SR 905 Phase IA project. He stated that litigation is still ongoing for three rights-of-way lawsuits with one trial next week and two more scheduled in November 2008. We are hoping that the cost of the litigation does not exceed the allocation for rights-of-way settlements.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated the SR 905 Phase 1B project has been submitted to Caltrans Headquarters for approval and will be ready to list for advertising this month with the bid opening scheduled in January 2009 and construction beginning in May 2009.

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public submitted an article that he had written regarding tolls and expressed his support for the work SANDAG and Caltrans have done with SR 11.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS

8. FUNDING EXCHANGE FOR SPRINTER PROJECT (RECOMMEND)

José Nuncio, Senior Engineer Financial Programming presented the item and stated that in December 2006, the Board of Directors approved a budget increase for the SPRINTER project of approximately \$98.6 million, part of an action to add the SPRINTER project to the *TransNet* EAP. He stated that Table 1 of the staff report shows the breakdown of that \$98.6 million budget increase. Mr. Nuncio stated that the largest component of \$50 million was anticipated to be funds from Proposition 1B.

Mr. Nuncio stated that at the time, voters had just approved Proposition 1B and the approach to appropriate the funds had not yet been established by the Legislature. This inherent risk in approving the funding plan was shared with the Board of Directors. To date, of the \$50 million, only \$8.6 million has been made available to North County Transit District (NCTD).

Mr. Nuncio stated that although the project is now operational, NCTD continues to spend money as they complete many of the final work activities. Due to the absence of additional Proposition 1B funds, NCTD has had to use other agency funds to pay for the SPRINTER. Also, due to the long delay and period of uncertainty, it was not known what the final outcome was going to be in the state budget. NCTD, through no fault of its own, finds itself having to deal with a cash flow problem because the state legislature has not appropriated the funds as quickly as NCTD needs them.

Mr. Nuncio stated that in order to address the uncertainty, staff proposes to revise the original \$98.6 million funding package. The main change is to replace approximately \$41.4 million in

Proposition 1B funds with *TransNet* funds through an exchange of funds. As the Proposition 1B funds are appropriated, these funds will replace *TransNet* funds already programmed on other *TransNet* transit projects, including SuperLoop, Mid-Coast, South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the Blue Line Trolley Retrofit.

Mr. Nuncio stated that two other options were considered but deemed not feasible. One option was to use funds other than *TransNet* such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), federal formula, or State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds. However, the fact that the project is now essentially concluded prevents non-*TransNet* funds from being used. The second option would be to borrow other funds in advance of the Proposition 1B State Transit Assistance funds. In this case NCTD would borrow through SANDAG's Commercial Paper program. This option however, would only add to the cost of this regional project.

Mr. Nuncio stated that it was important to note that the proposed exchange of funds does not cause an adverse impact to the delivery or schedule of any *TransNet* projects. Additionally, Section 7, Part B of the *TransNet* Ordinance allows for the exchange of revenues for federal, state or other local funds to maximize the effectiveness in the use of revenues. Mr. Nuncio commented that included as part of the package are other minor revisions that take into account actual receipts and are reflected in Table 2 of the staff report.

Mr. Nuncio stated that this action is not a budget increase. The SPRINTER budget remains the same. This action merely allows for a completed project to be fully funded.

Mr. Nuncio stated that this item was reviewed by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) at its October 15, 2008, meeting. The ITOC had a number of concerns and did not reach consensus on a recommendation.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the ITOC did propose an action on the item which failed by a tie vote. The action was to approve the staff recommendation with the following conditions: (1) staff will provide additional assurances regarding the timeliness for the receipt of Proposition 1B funds; (2) that the first priority for distribution of any Proposition 1B funds would be for repayment of the \$41.4 million loan; (3) NCTD would not be authorized to borrow any other funds until the \$41.4 million loan is repaid in full; and (4) staff will express to the Transportation Committee the ITOC concerns that with the downturn in the economy and lower sales taxes numbers that use of *TransNet* funds to backfill projects that are not receiving funding from other sources will cause problems in the future. After discussion, the consensus of the ITOC was to direct staff to report to the Transportation Committee that (1) the ITOC made no decision on this item, and (2) to express the ITOC concerns and comments to the Transportation Committee, and (3) to inform the Transportation Committee of the failed motion.

Mr. Nuncio stated that he would briefly address each of the following concerns: need for additional assurances for the timeliness of Proposition 1B receipts, the priority for repayment of those funds back to *TransNet*, that NCTD not be authorized to borrow funds until the Proposition 1B funds are received in full, and concerns about using *TransNet* funds in this manner given the current downturn in the economy and lower sales tax receipts.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the legislative language governing Proposition 1B specifies that appropriations for certain of its elements need to occur by a certain date. Although this specific

program does not have a legislative deadline to appropriate, California Transportation Commission staff believe that the Legislature's intent is to appropriate the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) within a reasonable time. Further, there has been no indication that the Proposition 1B transit funds would be at any greater risk than other Proposition 1B funds, having received the same voter mandate.

Mr. Nuncio stated that staff considers that the proposed transfer is an exchange of funds as allowed in the *TransNet* ordinance to maximize the use of regional funds. He stated that \$41.4 million in Proposition 1B funds identified in the original SPRINTER funding plan will be dedicated for use on eligible *TransNet* Major Corridor projects.

Mr. Nuncio stated that requiring funds to be repaid in full prior to borrowing any other funds is a condition that has not been placed on a regional transportation agency in the past, and would be a potential barrier to managing cash flow for regional projects. A major advantage of having locally generated transportation funds is to have the ability to manage programming and funding of projects within the overall program to react to developments beyond the direct control of the region. As has been staff practice, any future considerations for funding exchanges or loans would be subject to the approval process of the Board of Directors.

Mr. Nuncio stated that the proposed package assumes a one for one exchange of funds. Considering the SPRINTER plus the other *TransNet* Transit project budgets as a whole, the exchange of *TransNet* and state funds does not increase the *TransNet* programming. The proposed funding swap is a tool that helps SANDAG match cash flow needs to revenue. Historically, the availability of *TransNet* has allowed SANDAG to move local projects forward when state and federal funding was delayed. Staff advises that Board policy not restrict this ability. The staff proposal only changes the timing at which the *TransNet* funds are expended.

Mayor Jim Desmond (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]) requested clarification regarding what the costs or ramifications would be to NCTD if it did not receive the *TransNet* funds.

Mr. Nuncio stated that if NCTD did not receive the *Transnet* funds, it would have to borrow from the commercial paper program at a high interest rate adding significant costs to the project.

Mayor Desmond requested clarification regarding what costs are associated with the transfer of funds.

Mr. Nuncio stated that SANDAG would lose some interest received on those *TransNet* funds. He stated that the Board of Directors has approved this type of transfer between *TransNet* projects in the past.

Councilmember Hall requested NCTD to respond to the question regarding the impact to NCTD if the transfer of funds was not approved.

Richard Hannasch, NCTD Finance Director stated that the alternative would be to borrow from the commercial paper program but the cost would be significantly higher. This would be an unbudgeted expense that would have to be paid from operating funds and that would have a

significant adverse impact to services. He stated that it would cost NCTD approximately \$2.5 million per year to repay the commercial paper debt.

Mayor Jerome Stocks (Ex-Officio Second Chair) commented that it was important to keep in mind that this transfer will not impede the progress of any other *TransNet* project. Also, the SPRINTER is a *TransNet* project and it makes sense to fund it using *TransNet* funds. Finally, this is the best solution with the least cost and impact to operations.

Discussion ensued regarding the loss of potential earned interest on *TransNet* funds, high interest rate if borrowing commercial paper funds that would increase the cost of the SPRINTER project, the effect the swap would have on the delivery of other *TransNet* projects, any assurances regarding repayment of the Proposition 1B funds and the fact that any distribution of Proposition 1B funds is at the discretion of the legislature, the fact that the *TransNet* Ordinance gives priority for funding to unfinished *TransNet* projects, how the current economic crisis is affecting the region and the delivery of projects, and the fact that the SPRINTER project is completed and must be funded.

Mayor Madrid expressed his concerns that the Transportation Committee was not considering the comments made by the ITOC and that a year from now the Transportation Committee will hear a report that conditions are even worse. Mayor Madrid commented that the ITOC is a very educated group of individuals selected for their expertise, and this Committee is not taking their comments and conditions as important. He stated his support for implementing the conditions that the ITOC recommended.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification on the amount of interest the funds in *TransNet* are earning and Lauren Warrem, Finance Manager stated that we locked in rates at different times but the average is 4 to 5 percent.

Councilmember Monroe stated that at 4 percent interest, if these funds are transferred it would cost approximately \$2 million to the *TransNet* program and Mr. Gallegos replied that there will be a cost regardless. The decision is to transfer the funds at a 4 percent loss or borrow the funds at a cost of 6 percent.

Councilmember Monroe stated that this amount of funding is available to be transferred for this project and asked why the funds could not be used to fund Blue Line improvements to move that project forward.

Mr. Gallegos replied that the Blue Line improvements are an Early Action Program (EAP) project and will not be adversely affected by this transfer; in fact staff is working very hard to move that project forward.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification on Proposition 1B funds received other than those for the SPRINTER, and Mr. Nuncio stated that \$8.6 million of Proposition 1B funds that have been appropriated were given to NCTD. Other Proposition 1B funds went to MTS for purchase of buses.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his concerns that the Transportation Committee was not seriously considering the ITOC recommendation and that the ITOC could not come to a consensus.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff did not articulate well enough to the ITOC that the funding for the SPRINTER is a priority because this is a *TransNet* EAP project and is completed. Regardless of how it is funded, there is going to be a cost; staff is recommending the option with the least impact.

Mayor Stocks stated that we can't view this as income or money lost because the SPRINTER is a *TransNet* project under the first Ordinance and is an EAP project under the Extension Ordinance. He stated that *TransNet* funds are being spent for a *TransNet* project which is what those funds are designated for. The problem is that it was originally planned to use Proposition 1B funds and now we must use *TransNet* funds. This is a modification to the Plan of Finance but the funds are being spent correctly.

Supervisor Roberts stated that this action will cost money but the blame is that the State has taken those funds and until the State backfills those funds it will continue to have a negative effect. As long as the State has a budget problem it will continue to raid transportation and transit funding.

Mayor David Druker (North County Coastal) stated that one other consideration is how the Proposition 1B funds should have been used and that some of those funds should be used for projects that are not on the ground yet.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Ed Gallo (NCTD) and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve a revised funding plan, as shown in Table 2 of this report, and allow NCTD to begin to draw the *TransNet* funds in anticipation of an amendment to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program reflecting the revised funding plan (scheduled for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting).

6. FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE REGARDING REVENUE SHARING FORMULA FOR REGIONAL DAY PASSES (HOLD FIRST READING)

Vice Chair Dale introduced the item and stated that this is the first reading of the Proposed Amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance regarding the Revenue Sharing Formula for Regional Day Passes.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee waived the first reading of amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance that would implement a new revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.

Dan Levy, Senior Regional Planner presented the item. In June 2008, the Board of Directors gave a second and final reading to amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance that included eliminating the NCTD Adult Day Pass and replacing it with the Regional Day Pass. Implementation of this change is scheduled for January 1, 2009, subject to a new revenue sharing agreement being in place. Staffs from NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG have now reached agreement on a proposed revenue sharing formula for Regional Day Passes.

Mr. Levy stated that the proposed amendments add new language to the portion of the agreements entitled "REGULAR AND PREMIUM REGIONAL DAY PASS REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA." The proposed amendments would go into effect on January 1, 2009, and would apply only to paper pass sales. The amendments allow each transit operator to retain all revenue from

Regional Day Passes sold in their district and used exclusively on their vehicles. At the same time, revenue will be shared equally for passes purchased on one system and used on the other system, but only if the number of passes is a minimum of 25 and favors one district by 10 percent. Based on surveys conducted in June and September of 2008, the number of passes sold in each district and used in the other district is virtually in balance at this time, and no revenue sharing is required. SANDAG will repeat the survey annually to determine if the new revenue sharing provisions are triggered. The proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance include an expiration date of June 30, 2011, or sooner, if the Ordinance is revised to adopt any new revenue sharing recommendations stemming from the Fare Study.

Mr. Levy commented that it should be noted that Regional Day Passes are issued primarily on paper from bus fare boxes and ticket vending machines. Regional Day Passes include a magnetic strip; however, the technology does not permit tracking of where the Day Passes are being used, only where they are sold. As a result, SANDAG will conduct an annual survey to determine if the number of passes being used to cross district boundaries is in balance, or if revenue sharing is required. The cost to conduct the survey is about \$2,000, which will be shared equitably between SANDAG and the transit operators.

9. FY 2010 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND CRITERIA (APPROVE)

Victoria Stackwick, Associate Legislative Analyst presented the item. Each year, SANDAG approves a list of transportation projects to submit to its Congressional delegation for funding consideration during the annual federal appropriations process. The FY 2010 transportation appropriations process is expected to begin in early 2009.

Last year, the Transportation Committee approved both eligibility and evaluation criteria for selecting transportation projects for the FY 2009 federal appropriations cycle. In approving the criteria, the Transportation Committee recognized that Congress was facing many competing funding needs and that transportation appropriation levels were expected to be lower than prior years. The Board of Directors approved a list of the FY 2009 transportation projects on January 25, 2008, and projects subsequently were submitted to the Congressional delegation.

Ms. Stackwick stated that Congress recently passed and the President signed a continuing budget resolution (CR) for FY 2009. The CR did not include any discretionary transportation funding for FY 2009 projects. The congressional process for discretionary transportation funding for FY 2010 remains unclear. If any discretionary transportation funding is made available in FY 2010, it is expected to be extremely limited.

For the FY 2010 federal appropriations process, Ms. Stackwick stated that staff recommends using four eligibility criteria. The first three criteria would be the same as those used during the FY 2009 process: local projects would be required (1) to be included in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, (2) to have nonfederal matching funds, and (3) to be able to obligate funding in a timely manner.

The fourth eligibility criterion would require projects to have proper federal environmental clearance. (Federal environmental clearance previously was an evaluation criterion.) Given the expected amount of discretionary funding available, staff recommends that the limited resources be

dedicated to projects that have been environmentally cleared through the federal process; environmental clearance typically is a good indicator of how "ready to go" a project is.

Once projects are determined to be eligible, they are reviewed against a set of evaluation criteria. The eligible projects that meet a greater number of evaluation criteria are then included in the comprehensive list of projects. For the FY 2010 federal funding cycle, staff recommends using the same evaluation criteria as used during FY 2009, except that federal environmental clearance would become an additional eligibility criterion. The proposed eligibility and evaluation criteria for FY 2010 are that the project is in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan; that the project has the minimum nonfederal match (e.g., 20 percent local/state match); that funding must be obligated within the fiscal year requested; and the project is environmentally cleared through the federal process. Once a project is determined eligible, it would be reviewed by staff using the following six evaluation criteria: project is in construction and requires additional funding; project is ready to advertise; project improves security and safety in the region; project protects the region's investment in infrastructure, including rolling stock; project achieves environmental justice objectives; and project includes a mitigation measure required by a federal environmental document.

Ms. Stackwick stated that traditionally, SANDAG solicits local proposals from the region for consideration during the annual appropriations cycle. In addition to the local projects, the annual appropriations process includes *TransNet* Early Action Program (EAP) projects as well as regional transit priorities recommended by NCTD and MTS. In the last few years, Congress has not passed a budget on time, and discretionary transportation funds to the region have continued to decline. During FY 2009, project requests from SANDAG totaled approximately \$172 million.

During the last week of September, Congress passed and the President signed a CR, House of Representatives Bill 2638, the year-end appropriations bill that provides full FY 2009 funding for Defense, Homeland Security and Military Construction-Veterans Administration programs, while keeping the rest of the government running at FY 2008 levels through March 6, 2009. Passage of a CR almost ensures that no project earmarks will be included in the FY 2009 Department of Transportation funding programs.

Ms. Stackwick stated that following approval of the FY 2010 selection process and criteria by the Transportation Committee, staff will work with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, and Caltrans to prepare the recommended list of FY 2010 appropriations requests. To include additional projects for consideration during the FY 2010 process, local agencies will have until Monday, December 15, 2008, to submit transportation project funding proposals for consideration. Recommended FY 2010 transportation project proposals will be presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors for action in January 2009.

Mayor Desmond requested clarification regarding the fact that one of the proposed evaluation criteria is that the project includes a mitigation measure required by federal environmental document but the FY 2009 matrix indicates that none of the projects include a mitigation measure.

Ms. Stackwick stated that that particular evaluation criterion was added to the criteria list for FY 2010, and Mayor Desmond asked whether that meant the FY 2009 projects would not be eligible under the FY 2010 program. Ms. Stackwick stated that projects must meet the eligibility criteria but

then are ranked based on the number of evaluation criteria they meet. The projects do not have to meet all six evaluation criteria just a greater number.

Councilmember Hall stated that funding for the Mid-Coast transit project needs to be discussed by the Transportation Committee. He expressed his concerns that under the current economic conditions, funding for the Mid-Coast project may become a major obstacle and Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) stated that he would place an item regarding full funding for the Mid-Coast project on a future agenda for discussion.

Vice Chair Dale requested clarification on whether funding under this program was for new projects or could it be used to fund operations and maintenance.

Ms. Stackwick stated that staff submits the project list that is approved by the Board of Directors to the legislature for review. Congress will match the projects with the funding element that most fits the need and submit that list to each Committee for their funding consideration.

Mr. Gallegos stated that historically this is not just for new projects. The Board of Directors will determine the priority list for the region to share with the legislature what the priorities are for the region.

Vice Chair Dale stated that we must ensure the eligibility criteria are as flexible as possible to allow us to allocate funds when and where those funds are needed at the time the funds are needed. He commented that we need to ensure that our own rules do not constrain our ability to fund projects in the future.

Mr. Gallegos stated that federal funds always require a funding match, and this prioritized list of transportation projects will ensure that we focus the federal funds on those projects that have a funding match.

Ms. Stackwick stated that this process mirrors the congressional process. After we submit our list of projects, the congressional delegation submits those recommended for funding to the committees and if those projects do not meet the eligibility requirements such as a funding match, that project loses its level of priority on the list.

Chair Madaffer stated that the key to this process and what makes our region so successful for the federal dollars is that we have a unified approach. This gives our partners and local jurisdictions a deadline to submit their projects for inclusion on this list.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the local projects matrix and how the projects were ranked on the list.

Ms. Stackwick stated that the matrix shows projects submitted for consideration in FY 2009. Projects one through eight met all the eligibility criteria and at least four of the evaluation criteria. The rest of the projects either did not meet the eligibility criteria or not enough of the evaluation criteria. The projects are not listed in priority but coordinate with the local maps of the congressional delegations from north to south.

Councilmember Monroe asked why the project on SR 163 and Friars Road was not on the list and Ms. Stackwick stated that the project was not submitted for consideration in FY 2009.

Chair Madaffer stated that the project was still under consideration with the City of San Diego and it was a matter of timing but the project would be submitted for the FY 2010 list of projects.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond and a second by Chair Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved a recommended process and criteria for selecting transportation projects for the FY 2010 federal appropriations cycle.

7. STATE ROUTE 76 CORRIDOR UPDATE AND BUDGET ADJUSTMENT (RECOMMEND)

Allan Kosup, Caltrans Corridor Director presented the item and provided an update on the status of transportation improvements to the SR 76 corridor and a proposed budget adjustment.

Mr. Kosup stated that the *TransNet* Early Action Program (EAP) SR 76 corridor projects will widen and realign eleven miles of conventional highway through the environmentally sensitive San Luis Rey River Valley. This corridor is recognized in the *TransNet* extension ordinance as having implementation priority as it was one of the uncompleted projects included in the Expenditure Plan for the original *TransNet* program. The 2005 baseline estimate for the corridor is \$483 million. The corridor is comprised of three projects with approved 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgets. The three projects are the SR 76 Middle from Melrose Drive to S. Mission Road with a budget of \$158 million; the SR 76 East from South Mission Road to Interstate 15 (I-15) with a budget of \$242 million; and the SR 76 Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) with a budget of \$83 million.

Caltrans anticipates federal approval of the Final Environmental Document and Project Report for SR 76 Middle in November 2008. The Final Project Report contains an updated estimate for SR 76 Middle of \$244 million, which exceeds the current approved CIP budget by \$86 million. The \$158 million baseline budget for SR 76 Middle was established in 2004 based on an escalated 1999 planning level estimate. The current \$244 million estimate reflects increased commodity prices, the addition of more stringent water quality standards, revisions to grading methodology and extensive roadway protection adjacent to the river.

Additional scope was added in the form of environmental enhancements that include animal crossings, wildlife fencing, and native revegetation of barren slopes. To control the project cost, the team has, through extensive value analysis efforts, reduced the project footprint, limiting wetland impacts while at the same time reducing right of way impacts. Given the middle project's schedule for environmental approval, full construction funding must be programmed at this time.

The original plan was to build the SR 76 Middle project in three segments. Caltrans will now combine the three segments and will go out to bid it as one large project which Caltrans anticipates will provide significant cost savings. The baseline schedule for the middle project anticipated a construction start of July 2009. That start will be delayed until early 2010 although the use of the "Design Sequencing" delivery methodology will allow Caltrans to open SR 76 Middle in advance of the current December 2012 baseline date.

SR 76 East environmental studies are underway and Caltrans has scheduled the release of the Draft Environmental Document in early 2009. Formal consultation with federal and state resource agencies began with a June 2008 meeting. Project alternatives are in development and will be refined based on data gathered and public input at a scheduled October 22, 2008, public meeting. The current \$242 million estimate for SR 76 East is a planning level estimate. Based on this estimate, the final corridor cost would exceed the current budget by \$86 million. However, Caltrans is not proposing a cost increase at this time due to ongoing alternative development, incomplete scope definition, and potential new revenue sources including developer contributions, County Transportation Impact Fees, and casino development agreements.

While the baseline schedule for delivery of the SR 76 East environmental document has moved to early 2010, Caltrans anticipates completing all corridor construction in advance of the 2014 completion date included in the current CIP.

The SR 76 EMP project has purchased two mitigation properties to date and is actively pursuing additional parcels at this time. This item transfers \$12 million from SR 76 EMP to SR 76 Middle to fund environmental enhancements included in the project's scope.

In early 2008 the region requested state funding for SR 76 Middle as a part of the 2008 STIP process. The region did not receive those funds due to a statewide shortage of funding for the STIP. This item proposes to fully fund the Middle project by advancing *TransNet* funds previously programmed for right-of-way on SR 76 East. This programming action will not jeopardize timely delivery of any previously approved early action projects. This approach allows the region to use available federal dollars prior to using *TransNet* funds and in the spring of 2009, the annual comprehensive review of the *TransNet* Plan of Finance will be performed to assess other potential modifications to project budgets, including the utilization of past and anticipated construction bid savings.

Chair Madaffer expressed his support of the project and the progress made to date.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his concerns regarding moving funding into a project without knowing the impact to the overall *TransNet* program. He expressed his concerns that this project was going to be built regardless of the cost or how the increased cost would affect our ability to build future *TransNet* projects.

Chair Madaffer stated that most often a project's budget increases from the original proposal to the time the project is built and complete. Due to the current economic situation, the *TransNet* list of projects will have to be reviewed and re-prioritized for funding based on lower than expected sales tax revenues. In this case, this is a *TransNet* project and it is this Committee's responsibility to fulfill the promise to voters to build this project.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we delivered 21 major projects over the past 20 years of the original *TransNet* Ordinance but were not able to complete four of the original projects. These projects were budgeted with 1987 dollars and those estimates are quite obviously low. Hopefully over the 40 years of the entire *TransNet* program, we hope to balance the highs with the lows and find funding sources to deliver all the projects.

With the next transportation bill we hope to be in a position to advocate for funding. The infrastructure bonds from four years ago are allowing projects to go forward today. We need to

understand that this is a long term program. In the early 90's we had a similar situation where sales tax dropped and costs increased. We need to understand that the economic situation will improve. Staff will brief the Board of Directors monthly on the financial impacts to SANDAG and the transit agencies from the current economic situation so staff can be proactive.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) expressed her concern that this Committee is not acting as if there is a financial crisis. She stated that we are committed to these projects and they are all valuable to the region. Councilmember Atkins stated that we act as though we will get money in the future when we should be considering the potential impacts of not receiving the money. She commented that the transit agencies are having difficulty providing routes and services; we need to recognize the crisis.

Chair Madaffer stated that it is important to recognize several projects were not completed under the initial *TransNet* Ordinance and were not funded until the *TransNet* Extension.

Councilmember Atkins stated that she had to go on the record regarding potential impacts of today's action on the I-15 Mid-City Centerline project. She commented that this project is building density with smart growth principles in the inner city and transit is an integral part. If our actions today cause this project to not be completed we will lose community support for decades.

Mr. Gallegos stated that there is a requirement for a comprehensive review for project status and budgeting every 10 years under the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance.

Mr. Kosup stated that when Caltrans returns with the SR 76 East project, if we can't find additional revenues or match the scope, we will suggest project alternatives that stay within the scope for the project of \$168 million; it may not have the same functionality but we plan to stay within budget.

Mayor Madrid stated over the past 20 years every project this Committee has approved has exceeded its budget. He stated that we need to change how we look at projects. We continue to think that the economy will turn around and improve. If we continue to act in the same manner as in the past we will make the same mistakes in the future. Mayor Madrid requested that the Transportation Committee consider holding special meetings to address these types of special issues. We need to develop a process for every project with a checklist to stay within a realistic budget.

Mayor Druker commented that this project is an 11-mile project that cost as much as the SPRINTER but is half the length. Additionally, this project does not serve smart growth areas.

Councilmember Monroe requested that staff provide a graphic or matrix that shows how budget transfers and actions taken on projects on the *TransNet* list of projects today affect all the projects on the list, specifically which projects get dropped off the list because there is no identified funding source because of the actions we take today.

Mr. Orso-Delgado stated that within the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance this project is a high priority and must be built.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the redistribution of funds between State Route 76 corridor projects to fully fund the construction phase of State Route 76 Middle.

10. PROPOSED FY 2009 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT FOR INTERSTATE 5 SOUTH MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR STUDY (RECOMMEND)

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner presented the item. The FY 2009 SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP) includes the Interstate 5 (I-5) South Corridor Study as a pending work element. The draft scope of work was prepared in FY 2007 and initiation of the study was pending while funding was secured.

In 2005, the City of Chula Vista received discretionary funding included in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for "Project Design and Environmental Assessment of Widening and Improving the Interchange at H Street and I-5, Chula Vista." The funding allocation was modified at the City of Chula Vista's request to broaden the project's scope to "Conduct a study to examine multimodal improvements to the I-5 corridor between the Main Street Interchange and State Route 54" and was included in the bill known as H.R. 1195, which was signed into law in June 2008.

Ms. Kennedy stated that an amendment to the FY 2009 Budget and OWP will allow SANDAG, in partnership with the City of Chula Vista and Caltrans, to move forward with this important study that will examine projects and strategies for reducing delay attributed to congestion on several modes of transportation and will improve mobility for people and freight. Ms. Kennedy reviewed the proposed changes to the FY 2009 OWP element, as well as changes to other OWP elements from which staff resources will be drawn.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the study will evaluate multimodal improvements to accommodate current and future traffic demand in the I-5 South corridor from Main Street through SR 54 in the City of Chula Vista. It will focus on freeway and interchange improvements, including current interchange spacing and operation; light rail transit and freight rail services running parallel to I-5; and transit/pedestrian/bicycle circulation adjacent to I-5. This study will propose capital improvements, including preliminary engineering and environmental analysis with estimated costs and a conceptual phasing plan for financing and construction. The study is included in the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP).

Caltrans, Chula Vista, and SANDAG will work collectively on the study to assure coordination of the various transportation modes in the project study area. The proposed approach and funding allocation will allow for the development of a systems level planning analysis for the I-5 South corridor, which will be followed by future work on specific regional transportation projects located on the I-5 corridor within the City of Chula Vista.

SANDAG will be the lead agency and administer the study, in cooperation with Chula Vista and Caltrans. Through future action an ad hoc technical working group will be established. Staff from the City of National City, City of San Diego, Metropolitan Transit System, and others will be invited to participate.

SANDAG will contract with engineering consultant services for the study and the three participating agencies will contribute staff resources to the study effort. A draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) detailing the study and the fund reimbursement agreement between Chula Vista and

SANDAG is included as Attachment 2. Commencement of the study is conditional upon Chula Vista's adoption of the MOU and execution of a separate agreement between Chula Vista and Caltrans.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the study is anticipated to begin in late 2008. The Transportation Committee will be asked to provide policy guidance at key project milestones.

Councilmember Hall requested staff provide a briefing on the status of the entire I-5 Corridor at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors (1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista in substantially the same form as Attachment 2, and (2) approve an amendment to the FY 2009 Budget and Overall Work Program for the Interstate 5 South Multimodal Corridor Study to transition the project from pending to an active work element.

11. MID-COAST CORRIDOR TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Leslie Blanda, Manager of Capital Development presented the item. In January 2005, the Board of Directors included the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project in the *TransNet* Early Action Program. The Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project will extend San Diego Trolley service from the Old Town Transit Center to University City, serving major activity centers such as the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Town Center (UTC).

Ms. Blanda stated that the Board of Directors gave staff direction to move forward with the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project as a high priority. SANDAG staff has secured the services of an experienced transportation consultant with expertise in developing Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Projects. This expertise includes developing FTA New Starts Funding Applications as well as assisting clients with securing FTA Full Funding Grant Agreements. The consultant is well versed in all aspects of project development through the FTA process and has a proven track record of success within the industry. SANDAG staff additionally secured the services of a consultant experienced in public involvement to assist in preparation and implementation of a public involvement program to support all development phases of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. The services of a firm experienced in environmental law with experience in FTA New Starts Projects as well as other public transit projects will support the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project through environmental review and entitlements.

Ms. Blanda stated that the Mid-Coast Corridor Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is a light rail transit (LRT) alignment that begins at the Old Town Transit Center and travels north in existing railroad right-of-way to Gilman Drive. Three stations are currently proposed in this segment and are located at Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue. At Gilman Drive, the alignment continues north within the I-5 right-of-way to the proposed University Lane Station. The alignment crosses to the west side of I-5 and enters the west side of the UCSD campus just north of La Jolla Village Drive.

The alignment travels into Pepper Canyon where the proposed UCSD West Station is located approximately one block from the UCSD Price Center. The alignment continues to the east side of I-5 along Voigt Drive and serves the east side of the UCSD Campus at the proposed UCSD East

Station. The alignment continues along either Genesee Avenue or Regents Road and Executive Drive to the proposed Executive Drive Station. The alignment continues south on Genesee Avenue to the proposed terminal station located at University Town Center (UTC). A map of the alignment was included in the staff report.

Ms. Blanda introduced the Mid-Coast Consultant Team which includes PB Americas for design and environmental planning and the FTA New Starts program, MJE Marketing Services for public involvement, and Worden Williams, APC for environmental law issues.

Ms. Blanda stated that the current project development phase includes the preparation of an environmental document for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Preliminary Engineering is additionally included in the current project development phase. Preparation of the environmental document will include: development and evaluation of alternatives; conducting public scoping for the environmental document; selection of alternatives for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document; preparation of the draft environmental document; preparation of the final environmental document; and approval of the final environmental document. The Board of Directors will approve the final environmental document prepared under CEQA. The FTA will approve the final document prepared under NEPA.

Ms. Blanda stated that the first step in the environmental review process will be the development and evaluation of alternatives for potential inclusion in the public scoping process and in the draft environmental document. The alternatives include a revised LPA, additional LRT alignment variations, a commuter rail shuttle alternative, a bus rapid transit (BRT) alternative, a no build alternative and a transportation systems management (TSM) alternative. These alternatives are currently under development. The LPA previously adopted by the Board of Directors will be re-evaluated. The LPA will be revised to reflect changes in the planned I-5 improvements and other changes as well as to maximize its cost-effectiveness where achievable.

Ms. Blanda stated that prior to public scoping staff will present the alternatives, the findings of the alternatives evaluation and a recommended list of alternatives to be carried forward into public scoping to the Board of Directors for review and approval. The Board of Directors will have the option of identifying a preferred alternative to be carried through the public scoping process. This step is anticipated to occur in March 2009. During public scoping environmental issues and alternatives proposed for detailed environmental analysis will be presented to the public and interested stakeholders for review and comment. Public scoping is anticipated to be conducted in March and April 2009. Subsequent to public scoping staff will evaluate environmental issues and refine alternatives based on input received during the public scoping process. Staff's evaluation will consider practical and legal requirements for alternatives in the environmental document. The Board of Directors will then be asked to approve the alternatives to be carried forward for detailed analysis in the draft environmental document. Board of Directors approval will be requested in June 2009. The draft environmental document is scheduled to be completed in August 2010. The final environmental document is scheduled to be completed in August 2011.

Ms. Blanda stated that Preliminary Engineering can proceed once the Board of Directors has selected a LPA and FTA has approved the SANDAG application to proceed with Preliminary Engineering on the LPA. It may be possible for the Board of Directors to select a LPA prior to proceeding with development of the draft environmental document. Should this occur, the

Preliminary Engineering application can be submitted to the FTA in the summer of 2009. The New Starts Application, which is a portion of the Preliminary Engineering application, would be rated by the FTA in the fall of 2009 and the project's New Starts Rating would be published in the FY 2011 New Starts Report in February 2010.

Ms. Blanda stated that the Board of Directors included the Mid-Coast LRT Project in the *TransNet* Early Action Program. The Mid-Coast LRT Project was included in the original *TransNet* Ordinance and remains uncompleted. Under the *TransNet* Extension, the Mid-Coast LRT Project shall be given priority for implementation. *TransNet* includes \$670 million in capital funds for the Mid-Coast LRT Project and \$110 million in operating funds through the year 2048. Both the capital and operating included in *TransNet* are in 2002 dollars. SANDAG would be seeking FTA New Starts funding for the project. The proportion of local match provided by the *TransNet* capital funds, as well as the benefit to the financial plan resulting from inclusion of the *TransNet* operating funds, will be advantageous in securing a higher New Starts project rating from FTA for the Mid-Coast Project. The current cost for the Mid-Coast LPA is estimated to be \$1.2 billion in year of expenditure dollars. The estimated cost of the LPA alignment will be updated during the current phase of work to reflect any revisions made as the result of re-evaluating the LPA.

MJE Marketing Services will assist SANDAG in developing and implementing the Public Involvement Program for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Public involvement and outreach activities will commence with public scoping in the spring of 2009. Public involvement and outreach activities will continue through all phases of project development including the supplemental environmental phase, preliminary engineering, final design, and construction.

SANDAG will continue to coordinate with project stakeholders throughout development of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. Coordination with key stakeholders such as MTS, UCSD, Caltrans, and the City of San Diego is already underway. Periodic regularly scheduled meetings are anticipated with the key stakeholders. The Public Involvement Program, currently under development, will include a variety of methods for coordination with project stakeholders including the public. In addition, a Coordination Plan for environmental review is under development.

Ms. Blanda stated that the schedule assumptions for final design and construction outlined in this report are based on a range of project delivery methods that would deliver the Mid-Coast Project for revenue service between December 2015 and June 2018. Before any further information on project delivery is brought to the Transportation Committee, further evaluation is required of the different project delivery methods, including how the procurement strategies may fit into the overall New Starts schedule. A preliminary project schedule for the previously adopted LPA is shown as Attachment 2. The preliminary schedule indicates a range of start and finish dates for the final design and construction phases. This schedule is based on the assumption that a LPA will be selected by the Board of Directors upon completion of the public scoping process.

Ms. Blanda stated that key dates over the next year that are included in the preliminary project schedule for the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project are: Board approval of alternatives for public scoping in March 2009, Public scoping in March/April 2009, and Board approval of alternatives for the draft environmental document in June 2009. Future development phases include final design, construction, systems testing, and start-up of revenue service.

Ms. Blanda stated that the ITOC and the Board of Directors will be briefed at their November meetings.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff will provide regular updates on this project every other month until we reach the point of critical planning and at that time staff will provide monthly updates. This is the same procedure staff followed for the SR 905, SR 11, and SPRINTER projects.

Supervisor Roberts stated that this project is identified as high priority under the *TransNet* Ordinance and Extension Ordinance. He questioned whether it was possible to break the project down into two phases. The first phase could begin even sooner with the possibility to achieve budget savings. He stated that Phase 1 could be the portion of the project up to Rose Canyon at Gilman Drive which is about 80 percent of the line. The alternatives are identical to that point and SANDAG has control of rights-of-way up to that point. Phase II could continue the project from that point and alternatives could be discussed without delaying the entire project. Supervisor Roberts stated that he, Harry Mathis and Gary Gallegos met with Chancellor Fox at UCSD and she is a strong proponent for this project and is supportive of getting approvals from the Board of Regents for the portion that crosses the campus. He stated his support for the alternative that would cross the UCSD campus and provide for eventual connections in the future. He stated his support for a regular briefing to this committee.

Chair Madaffer stated that the potential where the existing rail line runs to Genesee Avenue, where there would eventually be a tunnel, is substantial especially due to the constraints north of Gilman Drive. Once the line crosses the campus the potential for future possible connections is endless, such as connecting with the COASTER.

Councilmember Monroe requested clarification regarding the conceptual look of the BRT alternative.

Ms. Blanda stated that the BRT alternative is under development and there are not many details available but staff plans to take advantage of some of the benefits of BRT and develop the best possible BRT alternative along I-5.

Councilmember Monroe stated that one of the problems with light rail is getting to the light rail station and then parking becomes an issue. In some countries they build light rail and busways in the same right of way so residents can take advantage of connections from home to light rail and suggested that staff research that possibility.

Mr. Gallegos stated that one issue would be that this is a very busy rail corridor with freight, Amtrak, COASTER, and adding buses may not be feasible but staff will have consultants research the possibility.

Councilmember Hall stated his support of transit and suggested that staff review the SPRINTER project and analyze the positives and negatives. He stated that prior to beginning this project staff needs to do a full analysis and determine how best to bring this project forward. He expressed his concerns regarding budgeting and planning impacts of this project when both the SPRINTER and the COASTER have had such significant cost increases and problems.

Mayor Druker stated that staff needs to consider a Phase 3 up to Sorrento Valley and a Phase IV down Mira Mesa Boulevard for this project. In order to get the public's support for this project, we need to get residents and employers in that area to support the project with the goal to bring more transit into this area.

Mayor Stocks asked whether elevated lines instead of tunneling would be considered when staff was studying the alternatives for the project. He stated that elevated lines have less environmental impact and a lower cost.

Ms. Blanda stated that depending on the location tunneling can have less environmental impact. Staff will look at the cost of both options, either tunneling or elevating the lines, at the applicable segments.

Supervisor Roberts stated that one segment does show a tunnel in the current project due to the steeper grades in that location.

Mayor Madrid commented that the San Diego State tunnel was the preferred option but staff did look at other options for the line. He commented that this project needs to look at all alternatives. He agreed that we need to analyze the SPRINTER project to better understand this project. Mayor Madrid stated that the City of San Diego needs to reconsider zoning for higher density along that corridor.

Chair Madaffer stated that SB 375 calls for density along this type of corridor.

Chairman Harry Mathis (MTS) stated that running buses along the same light rail route was done along prior to the opening of the Mission Valley East with very low ridership. Since the line has opened bus ridership has increased significantly. He commented that this project is an addition to a network that has existed for 25 years and is a proven quantity. This project is another increment to a very successful system.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

12. COMPASS CARD AND 30-DAY ROLLING PASS TRANSITIONAL DEPLOYMENT (INFORMATION)

James Dreisbach-Towle, Systems Integration presented the item. At the June 13, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting, the Committee directed staff to implement 30-day rolling passes to replace the existing calendar pass products. This replacement implementation will be accomplished by migrating from the existing paper pass products to the new Compass Card.

Since then, staff from SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS has raised concerns regarding how the transition would be made from the monthly passes to the 30-day rolling passes. The Compass Card program has been in the pilot phase and will be introduced to the public beginning in January 2009. The transitional plan, which has been previously shared with the Transportation Committee, has the region phasing out the paper pass products over a six-month period. Paper passes will be completely eliminated by July 1, 2009.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that the language that was amended into the Ordinance in June 2008 regarding rolling passes is in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Ordinance. The language in Section 3.6

states, "Effective January 1, 2009, each Regional Pass listed in Section 3 shall be replaced with a 30-day Rolling Pass." This language could be interpreted to mean that the monthly passes will be replaced and unavailable as of January 1, 2009. Staff at SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD is concerned that such an immediate elimination of the monthly pass would be unduly difficult for customers to adjust to and staff to implement. Therefore, staff intends to utilize a phased-in approach for the replacement of the rolling passes and other Compass Card products in order to ease the transition which he reviewed for the Committee.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle stated that beginning in January 2009, all regional 30-day pass products will be available on the Compass Card and will be sold at all Ticket Vending Machines, transit agencies' transit stores, on the Compass Card web site, via the 511 Compass Card call center, and at third party distributors. Paper pass products will be gradually eliminated over the six-month period. This gradual migration will give SANDAG and the two transit agencies time to conduct a marketing, education, and outreach program that will explain the benefits of the program and the details for using the new Compass Card. MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG will be conducting focus groups with the Compass Card pilot participants to better understand the customer experience and to refine the outreach program. These focus groups are scheduled for later this month.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

13. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, November 7, 2008, at 9 a.m.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 2008**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
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	Yes	
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	No	
	MTS	Harry Mathis	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit District		Ed Gallo	Member	Yes	
		Jerome Stocks	Alternate	Yes	As ex-officio 2 nd Chair
		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	Yes	
	---	Bill Figge	Alternate	Yes	
SCTCA	---	Albert Phoenix	Member	Yes	
		Shane Chapparosa	Alternate	No	