

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1B**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

Meeting of April 2, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:16 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

### 1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public or Committee member comments.

### CONSENT ITEM

### 2. MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) WITH THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT (NCTD) AND THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS), AND SANDAG BOARD POLICY ON ASSET OWNERSHIP AND DISPOSITION (APPROVE)

Chair Kellejian noted that a revised Attachment 1, Board Policy No. 028, was distributed to Committee members.

An MOU between SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS is proposed to establish a central document that includes the current and future agreements between the agencies. The first proposed supplement to the MOU concerns an agreement among the parties regarding ownership of real and personal property. A related Board policy is also proposed concerning ownership and disposal of real and personal property assets. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend approval of the MOU and the proposed Board Policy to the Board.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 2.

### REPORTS

### 3. REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING AND EVALUATION POLICY FRAMEWORK (APPROVE)

Staff reported that SANDAG is responsible for transit service planning and fare policy setting, and the Board needs to adopt policies in both of these areas. The Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) and a SANDAG Task Force have been working to help guide the development of a service planning policy. The JCRT has endorsed a framework and a

methodology for evaluating service proposals to use as a demonstration over the next several months. The framework was developed in collaboration with the transit agencies.

Staff described the service planning framework process. It starts with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, then MOBILITY 2030, which provides the mid- and long-range planning; to the Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for FY 2004-5005. The SRTP sets the goals and guidelines. When service proposals are developed, and if they are consistent with the SRTP then they would be considered for implementation by the transit boards. If the proposed service is not consistent with the SRTP then the proposal would be further evaluated. If it is determined that the proposal is not regionally significant it would go back to the appropriate transit board for action and/or implementation. If the proposal was determined to be regionally significant, then it would be considered by the Transportation Committee. The service and performance monitoring would still be conducted by the transit boards.

Staff stated that the service evaluation methodology guarantees a variety of services for diverse travel needs and services areas. The services are compared with its peers: commuter express, corridor express, urban, suburban, or neighborhood. The evaluation methodology for services within existing categories includes a quantitative evaluation using productivity (passengers per revenue hours) and cost effectiveness (subsidy per passenger) criteria. A qualitative evaluation will be used for new services to address identified gaps and deficiencies, determine whether the proposed service will support regional transportation and land use plans and projects, and its affordability. Staff noted that every route in the system is evaluated every year.

Staff reported that the second policy is a fare setting policy. This issue was presented to the JCRT but it has not yet been discussed. There are four objectives to this policy: regional, production, fairness, and simplicity. There are no new fare changes anticipated for FY 2005. Staff will recommend a policy to the JCRT in May 2004, and SANDAG adoption of this policy is scheduled for July 2004.

#### Board Comments:

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) stated that a lifeline service plan should be included in the service planning framework as a safety net. *Staff agreed that that could be included in the Service Planning Policy.*

Councilmember Rindone clarified that there is a third tier of a three-approach fare increase that was approved previously by the MTS Board. There will be no fare increase over and above that already approved for FY 2005. He also mentioned that in a similar policy at MTDB there was a two or three-year period that allowed new services to develop ridership before they were evaluated with their peer services. He thought that should be included as well. *Staff agreed that the MTDB policy included a two-year trial period for new services to build up the ridership to perform at a minimum standard. Staff agreed to include this in the new policy as well.*

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) asked if the lifeline service is geographic and/or time related, and how is this defined. *Staff replied that with a lifeline network, you look at existing transit service and you guarantee some kind of coverage for that system;*

*however, this does not include areas that do not already have existing services. The guarantee would be some minimal level of service. The Board can also determine access requirements as well, such as one-half mile access.* Supervisor Roberts reiterated that the lifeline service would include only existing service operating at some minimum level.

Supervisor Roberts asked who determines if a service proposal has regional implications. *Staff replied that the SRTP contains goals and objectives. It would start at the staff level in collaboration with the staffs of the transit boards. If there was disagreement, it would be considered by the SANDAG Executive Team. If there still was disagreement, then the matter would be presented to the Transportation Committee. After action by the Transportation Committee, the proposal would go back to the appropriate transit board for implementation. Staff noted that the issue of public hearings is still being discussed.*

Supervisor Roberts commented that the reality is that service changes are frequently contested by some group of people, and the determination of regional significance is subject to interpretation.

Chair Kellejian agreed that we need to strengthen the difference between local and regionally significant service proposals.

MTS Chair Leon Williams noted that the Policy Task Force did not consider the issue of subsidy as an evaluation measure for lifeline service. He stated that the issue is that some lifeline service may have a high subsidy amount. He suggested the consideration of a side subsidy that would allow someone to take a taxi rather than continuing to operate a high-subsidy service with low ridership.

Chair Kellejian noted that NCTD does have a policy with regard to capacity. He suggested that staff look at that policy. *Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, stated that NCTD's ridership measurement is that anything for lifeline service that had less than six riders per hour would be considered for elimination.*

Councilmember Emery agreed that there should be a more specific determination of regional significance for proposed transit service in the guidelines as well as a subsidy trigger.

Councilmember Rindone added that if a transit service has less than 25 percent regional funding, then it would be clearly within the authority of the transit board. He suggested that language be included in the policy to indicate that if a service meets that criteria, it cannot be appealed to SANDAG.

Chair Kellejian noted that there were no requests to speak on this item.

Supervisor Roberts commented that the objective for this Committee is to minimize its overview with respect to how the operations are being conducted on a daily basis. With respect to a lifeline system, financial considerations need to be included.

Chair Kellejian stated that by keeping highly subsidized services, you are depriving other areas of having more frequent or efficient service.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee approved the following actions:

1. The transit service planning framework for use in developing a transit service planning policy, including incorporation of the following direction by Transportation Committee members related to lifeline service, including a clarifying statement that if a proposed route is purely local and doesn't have at least a 25 percent regional impact it may not be appealed to SANDAG, and a limit to the amount of subsidy for lifeline service.
  2. The use of the service evaluation methodology as a demonstration of the policy process for evaluating new and existing services for the FY 2005 budget development process;
  3. The framework for developing a fare-setting policy; and
  4. Direct staff to return to the JCRT in May 2004 with an evaluation of the application of the service planning framework and service evaluation demonstration to guide a subsequent JCRT recommendation to the Transportation Committee for a Transit Service Planning and Performance Evaluation Policy
4. UPDATE ON TRANSIT FIRST SHOWCASE PROJECT (APPROVE)

Staff provided a status report on the Transit First Showcase project. The Transit First service concept has four different levels: community-based shuttles, systemwide mobility, intercommunity travel, and regional travel. Staff showed the alignment for the Transit First Showcase Project from San Diego State University (SDSU) to downtown San Diego. Major activities contained in the last report included development of project goals and ridership projections, commencement of traffic studies, transit signal priority research, conceptual station design, and public outreach and coordination efforts. Major activities for this report include the traffic and parking study, refinement of station design, preparation of shelter plans, transit signal priority approach, Balboa Park interface, preliminary cost estimates, and continued public outreach and coordination. Staff indicated that the top three project goals are to reduce transit travel time and improve reliability, attract new ridership through service and frequency upgrades, and enhance the customer experience.

Chair Kellejian noted that the reality is that if the *TransNet Extension* does not pass this project is in jeopardy.

Supervisor Roberts expressed concern about the sign in the station simulation as businesses along El Cajon Boulevard depend on visibility from cars driving by. *Staff indicated that it was felt the sign would protect passengers from the street.* Supervisor Roberts suggested that the sign and the canopy be eliminated and that more seating be added. He also suggested that the cost estimates include the amount of money it would cost to return the station sites to their original situation if the demonstration is not successful. He noted that we should try to make minimal changes within the community during the demonstration.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (NCTD) liked the idea of the transit network plan.

Councilmember Madaffer expressed his support for global positioning satellite (GPS) technology, indicating that it will be less expensive as time goes on. He added that we should use this technology to provide information for passengers. *Staff agreed that GPS could provide real-time information at each station. Staff stated that, if funding was available, this project would be ready to proceed within the next two years.*

Staff reported that there is a demonstration project with the Airport Flyer this summer that will use GPS to provide real-time information for customers. Staff is working with MTS and NCTD on the costs to operate and maintain this type of technology.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that on April 13 the San Diego City Council will hear a report related to the improvements around the San Diego Zoo. *Staff stated that the Zoo is not addressing the disposition of Park Boulevard in their plans. Staff has been working with the City of San Diego's Park and Recreation Department which has supported the concept of a "transit lane" along Park Boulevard through Balboa Park.* Councilmember Madaffer indicated that he would provide his support for this concept at the April 13 San Diego City Council meeting.

**Public Comment:**

Charles Daniels, representing the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department, conveyed their support for this project. They have been working on the Balboa Park Circulation Study and have received extensive community input on this project. The preliminary recommendation will be to incorporate this project onto Park Boulevard, support the shared transit lane concept on Park Boulevard, and support bus rapid transit (BR) on Fourth and Fifth Avenues in the area of Balboa Park. They hope to conclude their study in the next few months, and they will continue to work with SANDAG staff. He stated more information about the Balboa Park Circulation Study, can be found on the following Web site: [www.jonesandjones.com/balboapark](http://www.jonesandjones.com/balboapark).

Clive Richard, a member of the public, noted that there seemed to be a discrepancy on the names of the streets in Attachment 1. He questioned the amount of money to provide replacement parking spaces. He suggested that a parking structure be considered instead. He also expressed concern about shared lanes. *Staff responded that the street designations were cut off on Attachment 1. In addition, a real estate professional is assisting staff in looking at land acquisition costs for replacement parking. Staff clarified that the amount of parking spaces impacted depending on whether you go with a transit lane or a shared lane. The recommendation was to go with a shared lane in the middle section of the project. We do have a Transit First map and the Regional Transit Plan. The Transit Network Plan would be more detailed with a smaller geographic area and include bus and shuttle services.*

Councilmember Emery suggested that we look at a differentiation of terms between BRT and the Showcase Project to eliminate confusion.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans, indicated that Qualcomm is coming up with technology that would allow cell phones to pick up real-time transit information.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee approved the following actions:

- Support the concept of a “transit lane” along Park Boulevard through Balboa Park, to be designed in collaboration with the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department as it completes the Balboa Park Parking and Circulation Study and plan amendments.
- Approve the following Action Plan to further define the Showcase Project and address issues that have arisen in project planning to date:
  1. Authorize the preparation of a work scope, in collaboration with the Mid-City community, to conduct a Mid-City Transit Network Plan at a cost of approximately \$75,000 to be funded from the Showcase Project budget. The Transit Network Plan would define the operating concept for the Showcase Project in the context of a community-wide transit network.
  2. Pursue a peer review of industry experts to evaluate and provide input to the Showcase Project design and Transit Network Plan.
- Defer further preliminary engineering and final design work on the Showcase Project pending the completion of the Action Plan, which would result in completing the Final Design by mid-2006 with project opening (assuming funding availability) in 2007-08.
- Incorporate comments made by Transportation Committee members.

Chair Kellejian called a five-minute break at 10:48 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:53 a.m.

5. UPDATE TO MEMBER AGENCIES FROM THE LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) (SUPPORT)

Staff reported that the San Diego region is well represented with Chair Kellejian representing SANDAG, Councilmember Rindone representing MTS, and Councilmember Julie Nygaard, representing NCTD. Staff noted that the LOSSAN corridor is the fastest growing corridor in the region, and reviewed key changes in the corridor since 1989. Staff also provided corridor ridership statistics, which includes Amtrak’s Surfliner, the Coaster, and Metrolink commuter rail services. Staff noted that there have been major increases in service since 1974. Staff reported that last year Metrolink, Coaster, and Caltrans, started a six-month demonstration program where Metrolink and Amtrak riders can catch the next train using both services. The Surfliner trains were on time 95 percent of the time. Staff reported that over half of the delay in Surfliner service was related to interaction with other trains. Many of the priority projects (including double-tracking) that LOSSAN is advocating will address this issue.

Staff provided information on the funding success of this corridor, stating that more than \$1 billion has been invested by the state, more than \$300 million by local agencies, and more than \$200 million by Amtrak. Staff reviewed several regional priority projects, operations funding, future plans, and challenges ahead.

Staff also provided information on LOSSAN as an agency. The original objectives of the Rail Corridor Agency included: reduced running time, improved productivity, reduced interference, increased accessibility, increased safety, increased trains/seats, and increased comfort. Staff also reviewed the structure and member agencies.

Chair Kellejian concluded that there are many challenges within the agency and the corridor itself including funding, the future of intercity operations, capacity, and acceptance by member agencies. Chair Kellejian introduced Warren Weber from Caltrans and Liz O'Donoghue from Amtrak.

Councilmember Madaffer asked to what extent LOSSAN is involved in adding its influence to the High Speed Rail Authority related to new technologies. Staff responded that LOSSAN will provide comments on the Authority's draft environmental document. Specific comments will depend on LOSSAN's member agencies.

Councilmember Rindone said that he will be discussing Maglev technology at the May LOSSAN meeting.

Councilmember Ritter expressed pleasure with the Rail-2-Rail program and would like to see daily distance-based pricing for this program in addition to monthly passes.

Ms. O'Donoghue indicated that March was the highest ridership number for the Rail-2-Rail program. This was 30 percent higher than March of last year. It has been a great success for Metrolink and Amtrak.

Councilmember Ritter commented that it would be nice if this program could be expanded to riders who are not monthly pass holders.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee approved the following actions: (1) support LOSSAN efforts to improve the coastal rail corridor; and (2) continue to make conventional rail improvements along the coastal rail corridor a regional priority..

6. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for April 16, 2004.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:09 a.m.

Attachment

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
APRIL 2, 2004**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Encinitas	Christy Guerin	Alternate	No	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	No	
	City of San Marcos	Corky Smith	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	Yes	
	City of Santee	Hal Ryan	Alternate	No	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	No	
City of San Diego	----	Dick Murphy (Vice Chair)	Member	No	
	----	Jim Madaffer	Alternate	Yes	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
	----	Bill Horn	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit Development Board	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Member	Yes	
	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Alternate	No	
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Oceanside	Terry Johnson	Member	Yes	
	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	