

## Members

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

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

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

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

Phil Monroe  
*Mayor Pro Tem, Coronado*  
(Representing **South Bay**)

Ron Roberts  
*Supervisor, County of San Diego*

Bob Emery  
**Metropolitan Transit System**

Judy Ritter, *Chair*  
**North San Diego County Transit Development Board**

Terry Johnson  
**San Diego County Regional Airport Authority**

## Alternates

Christy Guerin  
*Councilmember, Encinitas*  
(Representing **North County Coastal**)

Jim Madaffer  
*Councilmember, City of San Diego*

Corky Smith  
*Mayor, San Marcos*  
(Representing **North County Inland**)

Hal Ryan  
*Councilmember, Santee*  
(Representing **East County**)

Jerry Rindone  
*Councilmember, Chula Vista*  
(Representing **South Bay**)

Dianne Jacob/Bill Horn  
*Supervisor, County of San Diego*

Leon Williams, *Chair*  
**Metropolitan Transit System**

Jack Feller/Dave Druker  
**North San Diego County Transit Development Board**

Mary Sessom  
**San Diego County Regional Airport Authority**

## Advisory Members

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

Bille Figge  
*Deputy District Director, District 11*  
**California Department of Transportation**

Gary L. Gallegos  
*Executive Director, SANDAG*



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, April 16, 2004  
9 a.m. – 12 Noon  
SANDAG Board Room  
401 B Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

## AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- TRANSIT OPERATING PROJECTIONS
- JOBS ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE
- SURVEY OF CROSS BORDER TRADE MOVEMENT

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

**YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT [WWW.SANDAG.ORG](http://WWW.SANDAG.ORG)**

## MISSION STATEMENT

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

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231  
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · [www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org)



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

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at [www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org) under meetings on SANDAG's Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 p.m., two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

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



# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, April 16, 2004

ITEM #		RECOMMENDATION
1.	APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES	APPROVE
	+ A. MARCH 5, 2004 MEETING	
	+ B. APRIL 2, 2004 MEETING	
2.	PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS	
	Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.	

## CONSENT

+ 3.	2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT (Sookyung Kim)	APPROVE
	The SANDAG Board, at its meeting on June 28, 2002, adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2003 to FY 2007. During the course of the two-year RTIP cycle, SANDAG processes amendments on a quarterly basis. Amendment No. 18 includes requests for revisions from local agencies. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2004-18, approving Amendment No. 18 to the 2002 RTIP.	
+ 4.	JOBS ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC)/AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT (APCD) – FUNDED TRANSIT SERVICE (Paul Davis)	APPROVE
	In 2002, Metropolitan Transit Development Board (now Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)), through SANDAG, was awarded \$200,000 in JARC and APCD funding to operate a reverse commute peak period transit service from downtown San Diego and Mid-City to the Poway Business Park. The service would provide employment access between areas where heavy concentrations of CalWorks clients live and work. MTS would operate the service, using the two-year grant funding. The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the use of the grant funding for the service (Route 830) beginning in July 2004.	

- + 5. **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (NCTD) WITH RESPECT TO SPRINTER FINANCING (Ellen Roundtree)** **RECOMMEND**

To enable the Sprinter project construction and start-up to continue on schedule while awaiting decisions on future State dollars from the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), North County Transit District (NCTD) plans to use private financing to fund the shortfall. NCTD is working with a financing institution that is requesting a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NCTD and SANDAG acknowledging the programming of future funding to cover debt service on the Sprinter. This MOU memorializes the action taken by the SANDAG Board at its March 26, 2004, meeting.

- + 6. **FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT (Sookyung Kim)** **INFORMATION**

In March 2000, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the allocation of TEA funds to nine projects and directed the Transportation Committee to receive progress reports on a quarterly basis. This quarterly progress report covers the period January to March 2004. Two projects are complete and the remaining seven projects are progressing according to their approved schedules.

- + 7. **SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF TRADE AND GOODS MOVEMENT BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND BAJA CALIFORNIA, MEXICO (Hector Vanegas, SANDAG; Geoffrey Bogart, SAIC)** **INFORMATION**

This survey was sponsored by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to collect valuable information on international commercial crossings to assess cross-border shipping patterns at ports of entry.

## **REPORTS**

- + 8. **TRANSIT OPERATOR FY 2004 AND FIVE-YEAR PRELIMINARY PROJECTIONS AND TRENDS/CHALLENGES (Paul Jablonski, MTS; Karen King, NCTD)** **INFORMATION**

A. The North County Transit Development Board (NCTD) will present its initial draft of operating projections for FY 2005 through FY 2009.

B. The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) will present its initial draft of operating projections for FY 2005 through FY 2009.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

INFORMATION

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, May 7, 2004 and Friday, May 21, 2004.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1A**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

Meeting of March 5, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:11 a.m. See the attached sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance (Attachment 1).

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the February 6 and February 20, 2004, meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Kellejian indicated that a memo was distributed in request from Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (South County) that staff review an article on traffic congestion. He noted that the Board members could read it at their convenience.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, reminded Committee members of the Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Walk/Swim event to be held at the Mission Beach Plunge tomorrow. He invited the public to attend. Mr. Lungerhausen solicited donations on behalf of MS, and noted that to date he has raised a total of \$5,010. He thanked those who have donated to this cause. On the transportation front, he said he hoped that Supervisor Dianne Jacob was informed that SANDAG is responsible for allocating the TransNet tax funds to improve transportation in the region, not just rural roads. He noted that the Board of Supervisors recently claimed that they have a \$25 million budget surplus. He wondered how this was achieved in light of the unplanned expenses of a recall election.

Supervisor Roberts responded that there was a higher level of surplus, but some of that money was used for the recall election and to fight the recent wildfires.

## CONSENT ITEMS (3 and 5)

Chair Kellejian noted that Item No. 4 has been continued.

Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) said that part of the reason we don't have alternative routes is that there is a limited amount of land available. He would like this issue addressed when it comes back before the Committee.

The Executive Director commented that part of the *TransNet Extension* is for improving the local arterial streets. As the region looks to adopt a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and start an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it is staff's recommendation to combine those two documents and then look at the land use changes projected for the region. This would be the time to look at how to pursue another north-south corridor.

### 4. NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORTATION FACILITY STUDY DEFERRAL (APPROVE)

This item was continued to a future meeting date.

### 3. INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) EXPRESS LANES WEEKEND OPERATIONS (INFORMATION)

Since late August 2003, the I-15 Express Lanes between State Routes (SR) 56 and 163 have been open for weekend operations. Based on an analysis of Express Lanes traffic over the past six months, weekend usage of the lanes in the northbound direction is nearly double the usage in the southbound direction. Caltrans proposes to operate the I-15 Express Lanes in the northbound direction beginning in mid-March 2004.

Supervisor Roberts said that this is good news, and it demonstrates that we can use existing facilities in creative ways. Caltrans acted on a recommendation that will benefit all of the commuters in the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor. He thought that this action might even save money since we won't need the crews on Friday evening to close down the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. He expressed his appreciation to Caltrans for the study and the efforts to make this a permanent solution. He also thanked Supervisor Pam Slater for her assistance in bringing this suggestion to fruition.

### 5. TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENTS (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution #2004-16 approving two claim amendments: (1) FY 2003 Fiscal Audit Claim Adjustment for NCTD, and (2) allocation to the City of Chula Vista for prior-year unallocated TDA funds. These funds will be used as the local match to purchase mid-size, low-floor buses.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 5, including Resolution No. 2004-16.

## REPORTS

### 6. DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIR/EIS) FOR THE PROPOSED CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM (APPROVE)

Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director of the California High Speed Rail Authority, reported that they are at a stage of the project where the draft environmental document is now out for public review. The public review period will end on May 14, 2004. There will be five public hearings, one of which will be held at SANDAG on April 20, 2004, in the SANDAG Board Room.

Mr. Leavitt noted that this project will have to be implemented in phases. The next step will develop project specific work. He said that California's population and transportation demands are the reason for the State's interest in high-speed rail. He noted that the projected population growth will mostly be due to the birth rate. He commented that California has the most severely congested highways in the nation, and we are finding it more difficult to expand highways and air transportation facilities in the state.

Mr. Leavitt stated that the study compared transportation alternatives for meeting the expected travel growth: No Project (which means no additional planning), Modal Development (which includes improvements and expansion), and High-Speed Train (to build a statewide high-speed train system). He said that the proposed high-speed train system would connect the major cities and regions, would travel at speeds of up to 220 miles per hour (mph), and would be 700 miles long. The high-speed train has worked in Japan for nearly 40 years and in Europe for 25 years, and is the safest and most reliable transportation system. Mr. Leavitt reviewed the major findings for each of the three alternatives. He indicated that the high-speed train alternative is preferred because it would be an economic stimulant and a smart investment.

Mr. Leavitt said that following the public comment period, the Authority will select a preferred alignment and station locations. He stated that the preferred alignment would transverse the I-15 inland corridor in San Diego County. He reviewed several options in San Diego County such as between Mira Mesa and the March Air Force Base, Mira Mesa to Qualcomm Stadium in Mission Valley. He also described several options for connections between San Diego, Orange County, and Los Angeles, including a conventional rail connection along the coast.

SANDAG staff reported on the SANDAG High Speed Rail Task Force recommended comments as follows:

- SANDAG continues to support conventional improvements to the Coastal Corridor and high-speed train service along the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG recommends a direct connection with downtown San Diego as part of the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG supports a link from San Diego to Los Angeles and the Los Angeles International Airport.



- SANDAG concurs with the Authority that Maglev technology and other technology that cannot share tracks with existing rail services be dropped from further study.
- TransNet should be flexible to accommodate for emerging services such as high-speed rail.

Staff noted that there were additional comments in Attachment 3 of the agenda item.

NOTE: Attached to these minutes (Attachment 2) are the more specific Board member comments that were transmitted to the California High-Speed Rail Authority on this matter.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved the transmittal of the following six comments on the PEIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System to the California High Speed Rail Authority:

- SANDAG continues to support conventional improvements to the Coastal Corridor and high-speed train service along the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG recommends a direct connection with downtown San Diego as part of the Inland Corridor.
- SANDAG supports a link from San Diego to Los Angeles and the Los Angeles International Airport.
- SANDAG supports continuing Maglev as an option.
- SANDAG supports a statewide approach that includes San Diego as a part of the first phase of any system or that includes funding of the San Diego section with certainty.
- SANDAG supports the concept of a high-speed rail system being extended into the South Bay region of San Diego.

#### 7. SENIORS ACCESS TASK FORCE REPORT (APPROVE)

Staff reported that the Seniors Access Task Force found that there are many public, private, and nonprofit transportation services for seniors that exist today; but there are drawbacks to those services including restrictive trip purposes and service areas, they can be somewhat inconvenient, and they require advance reservations. These services also require high subsidies and/or high fares. To meet various needs of seniors, the Task Force established guidelines for developing transportation solutions. Staff reviewed the senior transportation needs of age eligibility at 60 years, service that is cross-jurisdictional and that provides service for any trip purpose, and is highly personalized. The program requirements included cost-effectiveness, coordination, and support from local jurisdictions. Three recommendations were also reviewed that included short-term, mid-term, and long term actions. The short-term actions include an education program for existing services and pilot transportation projects; the mid-term action would be to develop action plans for

subregional projects; and the long-term action would establish a mini-grant program to fund the subregional projects.

Staff indicated that the pilot projects would leverage existing services to provide innovative services that meet senior needs and test service concepts for applicability and viability. Several suggested pilot projects include enhancement of the City of Vista's "Out and About" shuttle program, an enhanced mileage reimbursement program for Poway and Rancho Bernardo, and a neighborhood shared ride program in central San Diego.

Chair Kellejian thanked Councilmember Jack Feller (NCTD) for bringing this to issue to the Committee's attention and for serving as Chairman of this Task Force. He also thanked Councilmember Emery and Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe (South County) for their efforts on the Task Force, and staff, especially Nan Valerio.

Councilmember Feller also thanked Councilmember Emery and Mayor Pro Tem Monroe for their effort and staff's efforts. He noted that staff from MTS and NCTD was involved as well. He announced that the City of Oceanside will take the lead in implementing a pilot program. They will discuss this program with the cities of Vista and Carlsbad for a regional model. This program would use 12 and 18-passenger vans and will also help with some of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) responsibilities. The implementation of this program will result in complementary and coordinated services for seniors. SANDAG staff will report back in June with results of the short-term programs.

Staff noted that in the existing *TransNet* measure there is 3 percent for ADA services. This would be an additional 4 percent from the Transit portion of *TransNet*, for a total of 7 percent from the Transit portion of *TransNet* funding.

Chair Kellejian asked if this is in line with the current *TransNet* proposal. *Staff responded positively.*

Leon Williams (MTS) asked if there was a way for *TransNet* to subsidize the entire amount for senior passes. *Staff replied that it could, but that would take money from other services and operations. Staff added that it's possible we would realize some savings if these services were provided at a higher quality and a lower cost; however, an analysis of this has not been conducted. Staff clarified that SANDAG would be the clearinghouse for existing services in the region. This would lead to more efficiency and better service for seniors. SANDAG would also provide public information and marketing and a rideshare database program for existing volunteer driver programs.*

Chair Kellejian asked if staff had analyzed the impact of moving the eligible age for senior monthly passes from 60 to 65. *Staff replied that in 2004, 90,000 seniors would not be eligible; by 2010, 150,000 seniors would not be eligible, and by 2030, 210,000 seniors would not be eligible.*

Chair Kellejian commented that we need every vote for the *TransNet Extension*, and cutting out 90,000 people would hurt our chances of getting the *TransNet Extension* approved.

Mayor Terry Johnson (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) asked for the dollar cost for the senior program. *Staff stated that the mini-grant would be about \$1 million per year. With leveraging existing services, that amount could be reduced.*

Councilmember Emery reiterated the Task Force's consensus that the eligibility age for senior monthly passes stay at age 60 to enhance the chances of passing the *TransNet Extension*.

The Executive Director explained that there is some growth included in the 13 percent of the Transit portion, and the mini-grant program would use some of those funds.

Staff added that the Task Force recommendation is to delete the \$1.00 senior cash fares and replace it with this program. It was noted that most of the riders who used the cash fare were tourists and not residents.

Chair Kellejian suggested that the age eligibility issue should be reviewed as part of the ten-year review of the *TransNet Extension*.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) expressed a concern with the funding for the mini-grant program coming from the *TransNet Extension*. Staff stated that the number of people over the age of 60 is increasing. One of the things that we felt to counter this increase is the mini-grant program that would rely on volunteer and low-cost ridership. We tried to come up with an estimate that would minimize the impact to the transit program and still satisfy all of the senior needs. *TransNet* does not cover the entire subsidy differential. Other sources of revenue help to cover this expense.

Councilmember Feller pointed out that in the *TransNet Extension* recommendation money for ADA services is increasing from \$700,000 to \$2.5 million. In deference to ADA, not everyone will be ADA-needful but everyone will be a senior.

Staff agreed that there will be trade offs to expand the services for seniors.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, said that from an operator's perspective there are a lot of needs for seniors and the disabled that the current system does not meet. This program is a new way to try to meet some of those needs. Her concern is to retain flexibility in the overall program so we can use the funds to meet those needs.

Councilmember Ritter noted that at age 60 most people are still working.

Councilmember Feller stated that the senior community would feel that this would be a "take-away" if the age eligibility was increased from 60 to 65.

The Executive Director said that the savings from increasing the age of eligibility would not be significant.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Corky Smith (North County Inland) and a second by Mayor Johnson, the Transportation Committee approved the following actions to be taken to establish transportation programs for senior citizens in the region:

1. A short-term program consisting of two parts: (a) an educational effort to inform seniors and their families of existing transportation services that are available, and (b) pilot transportation programs to provide new or expanded transportation services to be operational before the end of 2004;
2. A mid-term program to develop an Action Plan to analyze needs for seniors' transportation in the region, identifying gaps and deficiencies, and develop more comprehensive programs to meet the needs. The Action Plan would address the feasibility of multi-jurisdictional programs, identify funding restrictions that may inhibit them, and propose alternatives to resolve such problems. This program would be completed in FY 2005.
3. A long-term program based on the *TransNet Extension*, which includes proposals to continue the discounted monthly pass for seniors and disabled transit riders and to establish a new mini-grant program to fund supplemental seniors' transportation services throughout the region.

#### 8. GROSSMONT TROLLEY STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL (INFORMATION)

Staff provided a progress report on the Grossmont Trolley Station Joint Development project. It is a 7.5-acre site owned by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) in the City of La Mesa. MTDB and City of La Mesa staff has been working with the developer for a mixed-use development on this site. It is located along Fletcher Parkway, north of the Grossmont Shopping Center and Grossmont Hospital. These activity centers are physically grade separated from the site and connected by an old wooden staircase. The site is currently developed with a 600-space parking lot that serves the trolley station and movie theaters.

Staff indicated that the benefits of this project include enhanced regional mobility, promotion of transit use and smart growth, reduced sprawl, and housing options. It requires active public agency participation including staff support, a feasibility study, \$2.7 million from SANDAG for pedestrian enhancements, and La Mesa Redevelopment Agency housing funds.

Rachel Hurst, Director of Housing and Redevelopment with the City of La Mesa, described the details of the project. She said that actions needed to bring this project to fruition include: completion of negotiations with MTS and the La Mesa Redevelopment Agency for a lease agreement and an affordable housing agreement (which is 15 percent of the units). The developer and the City of La Mesa need to complete the design and entitlement process, and construction.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, said he thought this was a great project.

Councilmember Emery thought that overall the percent of affordable housing should be increased.

Action: This item was presented for information.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meetings of the Transportation Committee are scheduled for March 19, 2004, and April 2, 2004.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.

Attachments

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
MARCH 5, 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	No	
	City of Santee	Hal Ryan	Alternate	No	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
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	Yes	
	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	No	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	Yes	

**DISCUSSION AT SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING ON  
FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 2004, RELATED TO AGENDA REPORT NO. 6**

**6. DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIR/EIS) FOR THE PROPOSED CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM**

**Board Comments:**

*Chair Kellejian:* I noticed on the slide and in the material that the system is considered to be at grade, but everyone knows it is grade separated and tunneled. That should be corrected.

*Mr. Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director of the California High-Speed Rail Authority:* Agreed that a clarification should be printed, because what it means is that we wouldn't change the alignment from that existing.

*Chair Kellejian:* Maybe your connotation of "at grade" is not the proper terminology.

*Mr. Leavitt:* We will clarify that. I should note that what you say to me today is informal comment for the document. It would actually help us to have that as a formal comment in writing.

*Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego):* I have several questions here regarding Maglev and issues relative to the fourth bullet point down on the blue sheet addendum (e.g, "SANDAG concurs with the Authority that Maglev technology and other technology that cannot share tracks with existing rail services be dropped from further study."). My first question is what is actually going on in Southern California right now with respect to Maglev?

*Mr. Leavitt:* There are two proposals in Southern California, one of which is a Nevada to Anaheim proposal, which has been looked at for probably the past 20 years. That is mostly led by Nevada. The State of California's primary interest is in connecting California's major metropolitan areas. That particular effort is very complementary to what we are looking at in California with connections in two potential places, Ontario Airport and Anaheim, where the two systems would come together at multimodal stations. Actually, Anaheim is preparing a multimodal station so you could transfer from a statewide high-speed train to a Maglev train that would take you from Anaheim to Las Vegas. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is looking at a regional Maglev system that is primarily focused on moving long-distance commuters throughout the region. This is a system that again could be very complementary to a statewide system. It would connect in certain places and bring passengers in as a feeder system. Our work in California is focused for the state on intercity, longer-distanced trips. The region here has an interest in not only utilizing infrastructure for intercity trips but also the potential for long-distanced commutes. In the Bay Area, we are actually working on a partnership with SAMTRANS on the Caltrain Peninsula so that the actual infrastructure, the tracks, would be used not only by high-speed trains but also by express Caltrain services to move both intercity and commuter passengers.

*Councilmember Madaffer:* I understand the recommendation of the Task Force that the Authority has indicated that Maglev and other technology can't share the tracks. What I'm really interested in hearing is that the California High-Speed Rail Authority is in fact going to be open to all technologies. I noted very much with interest during your presentation that Japan's high-speed rail system has been proven over 40 years, and Maglev is very new. At the same time, I would like to

make sure that anything that's going to have the expense of this magnitude, especially on a statewide basis, takes into consideration the future possibilities of using the same right-of-way. If we are going to go through the trouble of getting right-of-way and tunneling, wouldn't it make sense to have alignments available for future technology? How do you respond to that?

*Mr. Leavitt:* Actually, the State of California did look at Maglev for a number of years. The Authority began investigating Maglev from 1994 all the way until 2001. It was during that screening that the decision was made to actually eliminate Maglev and to focus on steel wheel and steel rail technology. In order to serve the population areas that we felt were necessary for a statewide system, that would not be possible with Maglev and it would not be possible with a steel wheel system that did not share tracks with other services. A key example is from San Jose to San Francisco. If you think it is important to serve downtown San Francisco and the San Francisco International Airport along the peninsula, we believe there is no other way to build that service on the Peninsula than to use the Caltrain right-of-way. There is not enough room in that right-of-way to operate in a completely separate fashion so we do need to share tracks, which can only be done with steel wheel on steel rail technology. In Southern California, for us to serve Orange County along the LOSSAN corridor we are going to have to be in a steel wheel on steel rail configuration. So, we believe it's very critical in serving markets that are important to the State of California to have a technology which is able to serve these markets as opposed to having to stop the system for example, in San Jose, and not going further.

*Councilmember Madaffer:* At the same time, I don't subscribe to the theory that technology today isn't going to necessarily work tomorrow. I think that we have to look at it much more in a macro. Perhaps 1994 to the present day is not enough time, but again ten years is really just a blip in the overall scheme of technology and transportation planning. My only comment is simple and I'd be happy to submit it myself for your adoption. I think you need to make sure that you are open for any and all emerging technologies even if they don't look like they are going to work or are possible today. Why is that yellow alignment in the Southern California area not electric? I'm looking on page 6.

*Mr. Leavitt:* I'd like to respond to your other comment first. Originally in Japan the high-speed rail system operated at about 130 miles per hour (mph). Today it is operating on those same tracks at 190 mph. We expect the next generation of the Chinkong (sp?) topping at 220 mph. The system that we are developing for California would not be obsolete. There is no reason that the next generation of the trains beyond 2020 could not operate at 250 mph or above. The systems in Europe and Japan right now are operating at 190 mph. At the same time, they have extensively been proven in revenue service. So, you have the benefit of knowing what these systems can accomplish realistically, but also the fact is that they will improve over time. The second question dealt with why the coast was eliminated. Again, this is an area that we have looked at for a number of years, and have done a number of evaluations. In this report, we did technical studies and environmental studies. The environmental work that we did showed that there would be considerable environmental impacts along the coastal communities by building a new completely double-tracked electrified system with overhead catenary. We found tremendous support for that recommendation from this part of the state.

*Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego):* I'm having trouble seeing something here. In order to have a significant impact between San Diego and Los Angeles trains are going to have to be convenient.



*Mr. Leavitt:* Absolutely. We're talking about for 2020, 60-80 trains a day operating every 10-15 minutes. One thing I want to note, we're talking about 2020, but this system would not be anywhere near capacity at 2020. You would have capacity for future generations where you could run additional trains on the track or you could lengthen the trains.

*Supervisor Roberts:* So, you've got these running really frequently, and your criteria is that we have to use the existing tracks so we can share them. How are you going to share tracks with a train that is operating at 40 mph and one that is operating at 220 mph and sharing the same tracks.

*Mr. Leavitt:* The trains travel at 200 mph through the rural parts of the state, but will be restricted in speeds in the urban areas.

*Supervisor Roberts:* We did hear you say you could get to Los Angeles from San Diego in an hour.

*Mr. Leavitt:* We're not sharing tracks with the freight trains.

*Chair Kellejian:* If I can clarify something. There are two corridors here in San Diego County that are proposed. One is the eastern corridor which will have the high speed trains with 10 to 15-minute service—is that correct?

*Mr. Leavitt:* Yes.

*Chair Kellejian:* That's the one coming down from Temecula through Escondido.

*Supervisor Roberts:* The coastal route is not really a route then. You show it on the map.

*Chair Kellejian:* That will just be an improved service from the that existing. It's not going to be the high-speed rail that was shown here today.

*Supervisor Roberts:* So, everywhere else in the state you're looking at there's track that doesn't get used by freight trains like we see it today.

*Mr. Leavitt:* Currently, the Caltrain Peninsula has mostly double track throughout, and in some sections they have three tracks. For us to be able to share track with them along that strip, it will become a four-track railroad. The two middle tracks will be used for express services, and the two outer tracks will be used for local services. We will only be traveling at speeds at about 100 mph, which is the same speed that the express services will be running at. We will not be sharing the same track with the local trains that stop at every station.

*Supervisor Roberts:* I'm looking at this line out in the Valley from Bakersfield to Fresno. Is there a line out there that doesn't carry freight?

*Mr. Leavitt:* We would be on a separate line.

*Supervisor Roberts:* So, you'll put new track in because there's no track out there today.

*Mr. Leavitt:* We will be looking along freight rail lines, but we would not be sharing tracks with US freight anywhere we are going 200 mph.

*Supervisor Roberts:* The picture now that is emerging is that virtually almost throughout the state you are going to be building new lines that don't currently exist. You made it sound initially like you were going to use the tracks that are there.

*Mr. Leavitt:* The high-speed train system is only effective if you can get to the central part of the areas. We don't believe that getting to San Jose is adequate service to the Bay Area. We think that we need to get to San Francisco.

*Supervisor Roberts:* I understand that. The distance from San Jose to San Francisco is minor compared to these other enormous distances, and it's over these enormous distances that you're going to have to put new track down. Part of the reason that you're going with conventional technology seems to me to be kind of weak.

*Mr. Leavitt:* You can submit your perspective to our Authority Board. The Authority Board's perspective is that the system is not adequate to go from San Jose to Los Angeles, and that there are other populations that the high-speed rail system needs to serve, such as San Francisco and Orange County, and San Diego beyond urbanized areas. It's not adequate to have a system that just links the two major metropolitan areas without actually getting to the heart of the metropolitan areas.

*Supervisor Roberts:* How does all of this get paid for?

*Mr. Leavitt:* While the revenue from the system would offset the operations and maintenance cost and would actually create a revenue surplus for the operations, the capital cost has to be largely publicly financed.

*Supervisor Roberts:* Is that a bond issue?

*Mr. Leavitt:* Right now, the funding does not exist to build the high-speed train system. While we have been doing this environmental process, there was a \$10 billion bond measure that was passed and signed by the previous Administration to put on the ballot for November 2004. \$9 billion would be for construction of a first segment of the system between the Bay Area and Los Angeles. With the current status of the state, there are several proposals to move that bond measure to a later date. It is being discussed in the Legislature right now. The Governor in his recent budget actually proposed recalling that measure.

*Mayor Corky Smith (San Marcos):* What is the timing of this, when will it start, and how long will it take to get it finished?

*Mr. Leavitt:* The timing is contingent on getting financing. We estimate that if financing is provided the first segment could be constructed within the first 10-12 years. We expect that the whole statewide network would be in operation by 2020.

*Mayor Smith:* The first phase would be from Los Angeles to San Francisco?

*Mr. Leavitt:* That was not designated by the High-Speed Rail Authority. That was designated by the Legislature and the previous Administration in the bond measure. They put a contingency in the bond measure that the first segment would be San Francisco to Los Angeles.

*Councilmember Emery (MTS):* I'm a little disturbed with the recommendation by the SANDAG High-Speed Rail Task Force. My problem is that the allocations for transit operations in *TransNet* don't cover what we have planned in the future, let alone external and other uses. I think we have to be careful about what we add. We have great plans for construction and capital outlay but we don't have great plans for operations. How much can you put in a corridor? If we're talking about I-15 between Escondido or even Temecula and San Diego and we are putting in a multilane flex system, BRT, and so on, where are we going to fit rail?

*Chair Kellejian:* Let's let the Executive Director take on the issue of *TransNet* and what's been recommended by the High-Speed Rail Task Force. Because of prior meetings, I wasn't able to attend yesterday's meeting.

*Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director:* Councilmember Emery raises a very legitimate point. As we tried to build flexibility into *TransNet*, the discipline has been that if we're going to build a line with *TransNet* then there are operating dollars there to operate it through the life of the *TransNet* measure. So, all the new projects in the draft *TransNet* Expenditure Plan today, not only have the cost of capital but the cost for operations built in to them. Our challenge is that *TransNet* is not solving all of our needs. The pie is probably not big enough to expand it to add new services. You have to cut something out to make capacity for something else.

*Councilmember Jack Feller (Oceanside):* I've only had one experience with the Shinkong(sp?) system, but that has a through train that operates at 200 mph and then the puddle jumper that goes on the other track that diverts and stops at every stop. The one question I did have is how many actual trains will this high-speed trains system require?

*Mr. Leavitt:* The number varies between the demands we forecast. It is somewhere between 30-40 trains. The actual number is in the operating report.

*Supervisor Roberts:* I wanted to comment on the recommendation before us. I'm concerned with the fourth of the three recommendations that SANDAG concurs with the Authority. I cannot support that. I think that we should take a different position and look at Maglev. I don't have anything against conventional high-speed rail. It is proven, but I've also seen the Maglev line in operation in Shanghai. I don't want to sell this whole state short. I think we ought to be looking at a system that's going to be around for the next 100 years. I thought the reason why they were eliminating Maglev technology was that they were going to use the existing track, but what they are telling us is that virtually the whole system is going to have new track. To use that as a reason for ruling out Maglev isn't something I feel comfortable supporting. The other thing that gives me a concern is a state ballot proposition that is going to spend billions of dollars putting a train between Los Angeles and San Francisco, especially when the planning into San Diego hinges on having an end of the route at Qualcomm Stadium. This seems to be exceedingly short-sighted. Anyone who looks at that piece of property and thinks that there is going to be an opportunity because there is an empty parking lot, they are not very forward looking. For that reason, I have some concerns about the legitimacy of the planning as it relates to San Diego. Irrespective of what happens to the Chargers, I think it is safe to assume that in the probably not too distant future

you're going to see things happening to Qualcomm and it's not going to be available for a high-speed train station unless somebody has an awful lot of money to buy it. It's not a political statement, it's a reality. It seems to me to be a major flaw in the planning and I'm wondering how sincere this planning is with respect to San Diego. I know that Los Angeles and San Francisco probably want this, but if there is a bond issue and we're not included, knowing that we have a real commitment to part of the improvements, it may never happen and you would have sold this region short again. I think that we have to express this pretty clearly. If we're going to be asked to support something, we ought to know that there is some certainty that we are going to be part of that.

*Chair Kellejian:* Mr. Leavitt, can you come back up, please. I need an explanation. You've heard Mr. Roberts' comments and it's been shared by others here. What is the reason why Maglev cannot be used specifically. I understand that in the open areas, Maglev would not be a problem at all, but it's when you get into the metropolitan areas that you have a problem with Maglev operations. Explain that in detail to us.

*Mr. Leavitt:* There is not necessarily a problem with Maglev technology coming into San Diego because it's an inland corridor. Where we've noted it's a problem is in the Bay Area. We do not feel that it's adequate service to the San Francisco Bay Area to have a transfer at San Jose to other parts of the Bay Area. You cannot use the LOSSAN corridor to bring trains to Anaheim or to Irvine other than with a steel wheeled system. Connecting to these parts of the state we believe are critical to building the high-speed train system in California. Certainly if San Diego disagrees with that, that's a comment that can be made. Along the I-15 corridor, it could be steel wheel or Maglev. It's a new corridor and there are no existing freight services along I-15. We're looking at a statewide system, not just from Los Angeles to San Diego. If San Diego is more interested in a Maglev piece from Los Angeles to San Diego, that could be a separate issue. A linked system from San Diego to San Francisco needs to be a steel wheel on a steel rail system.

*Councilmember Madaffer:* I agree with Supervisor Roberts wholeheartedly. I have real problems with bullet point No. 4. I just think that we're getting shortchanged in the San Diego region with this plan. You do require voter support on this thing and just like our *TransNet* measure, we have to make sure it has things in it that are going to make sense to folks here. I don't think that just ignoring or limiting the technology to steel wheel only is the right approach. I really would like to see that fourth bullet point reworked something along the lines that "SANDAG implores or encourages the Authority to continue planning for Maglev and other technologies, and they should be included in further studies." Let's not bury our heads in the sand because steel wheel is the great thing of today. I just want to make sure that we are planning for tomorrow in whatever we do. I'm concerned about Southern California and San Diego and the Riverside/San Diego corridor. It is meltdown on I-15 right now with people needing to live in Temecula and Murrieta and other places to find affordable housing. We know that it's only going to get worse in this region. I get troubled when I hear a state agency that ultimately will get its funding by a bond measure that the citizens of this state will have to pay for if we are not looking at all options. I have no problem with where you are headed with any of this. I just have a problem limiting our options because I believe that we ought to be looking at all things.

*Councilmember Rindone:* I want to weigh in at this point because I've discussed this before at previous SANDAG meetings when this has come forth. I think where we see the concerns expressed by Supervisor Roberts and Councilmember Madaffer are appropriate. We are a planning agency.

We are to represent San Diego County. But, more importantly, San Diego is the second largest city in the state. The fact is that the recommendation before us in bullet point four is inadequate and shortsighted. The purpose of SANDAG is as a regional planning group. In China, Maglev technology is workable and superior to steel wheel on steel rail. Basically you will be re-tracking everything whether it is two rails or four. The community I represent is Chula Vista, and it is the seventh fastest growing city in the nation. We've got two million people south of us who would utilize this system as well, and to stop short in North County or Mission Valley is woefully inadequate and irresponsible on our part in representation. It is no small chance that you have the seventh fastest growing city south of us. This report does not pay any attention to that. I would certainly support where Supervisor Roberts and Councilmember Madaffer comments. But I would want to add one final comment to those--that the high-speed rail system should connect into the South Bay. Congressman Bob Filner has worked to get a study of a corridor from the South Bay to Sacramento and to get congressional support. We need to represent the entire area of San Diego County not just North County. This system doesn't even serve North County very well. I see Maglev eventually having a Los Angeles to Las Vegas route and for us not to prepare for that option would be inadequate.

*Supervisor Roberts:* I'd like to make a motion: that we would accept the first three recommendations as they are written, and that we would rewrite the fourth bullet point to say that "SANDAG supports continuing Maglev as an option." I'd also like to add a fifth bullet point and that is, "SANDAG supports a statewide approach that includes San Diego as a part of the first phase of any system or that includes funding of the San Diego section with certainty."

*Councilmember Madaffer:* I second that, and I'll give a sixth point if you don't mind as an amendment.

*Supervisor Roberts:* That's fine.

*Councilmember Madaffer:* "that the high-speed rail should extend into the South Bay region of San Diego."

*Supervisor Roberts:* I feel comfortable with that. The problem I have is that with high-speed rail you don't put stations 12-15 miles apart.

*Councilmember Rindone:* No, but I think the wording is to consider linking all San Diego County including South County. We will not determine how that's done today. I would support the sixth bullet point made by Councilmember Madaffer.

*Mayor Terry Johnson (Oceanside):* I was just going to say I support and agree with all the comments I've heard this morning regarding this item. Just a point of clarification for the record, when I heard Councilmember Rindone speaking earlier he made reference to North County, and I wasn't quite sure if he was referring to Mission Valley or actually North County.

*Councilmember Rindone:* Mission Valley.

*Mayor Smith:* My only comment is that I have to agree with Councilmember Emery that we have to be very nervous about using *TransNet* money for operations of something that the state wants to do.

*Councilmember Madaffer:* Mr. Roberts included in his motion to have San Diego as a first priority in funding.

*Chair Kellejian:* We do have a motion in front of us. All those in favor of the motion, say aye. Any opposed? The motion passes.

# 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	

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA REPORT NO.: **3**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## 2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT

### Introduction

The SANDAG Board, at its meeting on June 28, 2002, adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2003 to FY 2007. During the course of the two-year RTIP cycle, SANDAG processes amendments on a quarterly basis. Amendment No. 18 includes requests for changes submitted by Caltrans and the Cities of Coronado, San Diego, and Santee.

### Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee adopt Resolution No. 2004-18, approving Amendment No. 18 to the 2002 RTIP, as shown in Table 1, attached.

### Discussion

This quarterly amendment includes revision to existing projects as briefly described below (also see the attached table for further details).

#### *Caltrans*

I-5 HOV/Managed Lanes Study (CAL09): Adds \$357,787 in TransNet-Highway funds from CAL31 in order to provide the local match needed for the \$4 million in Interstate Maintenance Discretionary (IMD) funds. Move the same amount (\$357,787) in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to CAL31. The total project cost remains \$12,337,000.

State Route 125 Toll, Gap, Connector (CAL31): Increase RSTP funds by \$357,787 (from CAL09) and reduce like amount of TransNet-Highway funds. The total project cost remains \$463,166,000.

#### *City of Coronado*

SR 75 Tunnel (CO05): Adds \$500,000 to the Corridor and Borders Infrastructure (CBI) program from the FY 2004 federal appropriations. The total project cost to date increases to \$10 million.

### *City of San Diego*

Interstate 5 (I-5)/State Route (SR) 56 Interchange (SD88): Moves \$1,500,000 from the Surface Transportation Program from the Preliminary Engineering phase to the Construction phase. Various operational improvements such as left-turn lanes, additional through lanes, auxiliary lanes, and ramp widenings are needed in anticipation of the opening of SR 56. Also, adds \$1 million in Demonstration funds from the FY 2004 federal appropriations. The total project cost increases to \$5,378,000.

### *City of Santee*

Forester Creek Channelization (SNT02): Revises funding between fiscal years to reflect appropriate obligation of funds. Total project cost remains \$29,100,000.

### **Air Quality Analysis**

On March 28, 2003, SANDAG adopted the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including the air quality conformity finding, and redetermined conformity of the 2002 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan for the San Diego region.

Projects in Amendment No. 18 have been demonstrated that they satisfy the requirements of 40 CFR 93.118 without a new regional emissions analysis in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(e)(2)(ii). The capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 18 were included in the regional emission analysis of the 2030 RTP with design, concept, and scope adequately detailed to determine their contribution to the RTP's regional emissions at the time of conformity determination. The design concept, scope, and implementation schedule of the projects are not significantly different from that described in the 2030 RTP. Other projects identified in Amendment No. 18 are either noncapacity increasing or exempt from the requirement to determine conformity according to Section 93.126 of the Transportation Conformity Rule. SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine that these projects were exempt. The funding for the projects in Amendment No. 18 will not delay the implementation of the RTIP. The 2002 RTIP, including Amendment No. 18, remains in conformance with the air quality program.

RENÉE WASMUND  
Director of Finance

Attachment

Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; ski@sandag.org





San Diego's Regional Planning Agency

401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(619) 699-1900 • Fax (619) 699-1905  
[www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org)

# **RESOLUTION**

**NO.** 2004-18

## APPROVING AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO THE 2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2002, SANDAG adopted the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), including the air quality conformity finding with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality; and

WHEREAS, on March 28, 2003, SANDAG made a finding of conformity of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and redetermined conformity of the 2002 RTIP with the SIP and the 1998 Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS); and

WHEREAS, local agencies have requested project revisions for inclusion into the 2002 RTIP as shown in Table 1; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment is consistent with the 2030 RTP; and

WHEREAS, the regionally significant capacity increasing projects have been incorporated into the quantitative air quality emissions analysis and conformity findings conducted for the 2030 RTP and the 2002 RTIP Amendment No. 18; and

WHEREAS, projects in Amendment No. 18 have been demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of 40 CFR 93.118 and 93.119 without a new regional emissions analysis in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(e)(2)(ii); and

WHEREAS, the capacity increasing projects in Amendment No. 18 were included in the regional emission analysis of the 2030 RTP with design, concept, and scope adequately detailed to determine their contribution to the RTP's regional emissions at the time of conformity determination; and the design concept, scope, and implementation schedule of these projects are not significantly different from that described in the 2030 RTP.

WHEREAS, all other projects included in Amendment No. 18 are either noncapacity increasing or exempt from the requirements to determine conformity; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors delegated the authority for RTIP amendments including findings of air quality conformity to the Transportation Committee; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation Committee does hereby approve the attached Table 1 as Amendment No. 18 to the 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that SANDAG finds the 2002 RTIP, including Amendment No. 18, in conformance with the SIP and RAQS for the San Diego region.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Amendment No. 18 to the 2002 RTIP is consistent with SANDAG Intergovernmental Review Procedures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Amendment No. 18 to the 2002 RTIP is consistent with SANDAG Public Participation Policy.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2004.

---

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_

SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.  
ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North San Diego County Transit Development Board, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, and Baja California/Mexico.

**Table 1**  
**2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment No. 18**  
**San Diego Region (in \$000s)**

## Caltrans

<b>MPO ID:</b> CAL09		<b>CAPACITY STATUS:</b> CI								
<b>TITLE:</b> I-5 HOV/Managed Lanes Study										
<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> From San Diego to Oceanside - construct HOV/Managed Lanes										
<b>Change Reason:</b> Add \$358K in TransNet-H funds (from CAL31) to match IMD; reduce like amount of RSTP and move to CAL31										
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
IMD	\$4,000		\$4,000					\$4,000		
RSTP	\$3,183	\$3,183						\$3,183		
STIP-RIP	\$2,796	\$459	\$2,337					\$2,796		
STP*	\$2,000		\$2,000					\$2,000		
TransNet-H	\$358		\$358					\$358		
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$12,337</b>	<b>\$3,642</b>	<b>\$8,695</b>					<b>\$12,337</b>		
<i>PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT</i>										
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
IMD	\$4,000		\$4,000					\$4,000		
RSTP	\$3,541	\$3,541						\$3,541		
STIP-RIP	\$2,796	\$459	\$2,337					\$2,796		
STP*	\$2,000		\$2,000					\$2,000		
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$12,337</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>	<b>\$8,337</b>					<b>\$12,337</b>		
<i>*Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed FY 2003 appropriations)</i>										

<b>MPO ID:</b> CAL31		<b>CAPACITY STATUS:</b> CI								
<b>TITLE:</b> State Route 125 (Toll, Gap, Connector)										
<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> From SR 905 to SR 54 - construct 6-lane freeway with interchange and HOV										
<b>Change Reason:</b> Increase RSTP by \$358K (from CAL09); reduce like amount of TransNet-H and move to CAL09										
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
RSTP	\$107,266	\$67,729	\$39,537						\$29,116	\$78,150
Private Funds	\$332,946	\$189,871	\$110,846	\$32,229				\$24,850	\$40,075	\$268,021
TransNet-H	\$22,954	\$14,731	\$7,423	\$800					\$3,764	\$19,190
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$463,166</b>	<b>\$272,331</b>	<b>\$157,806</b>	<b>\$33,029</b>				<b>\$24,850</b>	<b>\$72,955</b>	<b>\$365,361</b>
<i>PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT</i>										
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
RSTP	\$106,908	\$67,729	\$39,179						\$29,116	\$77,792
Private Funds	\$332,946	\$189,871	\$110,846	\$32,229				\$24,850	\$40,075	\$268,021
TransNet-H	\$23,312	\$14,731	\$7,781	\$800					\$3,764	\$19,548
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$463,166</b>	<b>\$272,331</b>	<b>\$157,806</b>	<b>\$33,029</b>				<b>\$24,850</b>	<b>\$72,955</b>	<b>\$365,361</b>

**Table 1**  
**2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment No. 18**  
**San Diego Region (in \$000s)**

**City of Coronado**

<b>MPO ID:</b> CO05		<b>CAPACITY STATUS:</b> Exempt									
<b>TITLE:</b> SR 75 Tunnel											
<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> EIS to provide analysis of a tunnel and other congestion relief alternatives to SR 75											
<b>Change Reason:</b> Add FY 2004 appropriations											
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>	
TCSP	\$564	\$564						\$564			
STP	\$745		\$745					\$745			
Local Funds	\$8,337	\$1,937		\$6,400				\$8,337			
CBI	\$500			\$500				\$500			
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$10,146</b>		<b>\$745</b>	<b>\$6,900</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,146</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<i>PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT</i>											
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>	
TCSP	\$564	\$564						\$564			
STP	\$750		\$750					\$750			
Local Funds	\$8,337	\$1,937		\$6,400				\$8,337			
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$9,651</b>		<b>\$750</b>	<b>\$6,400</b>				<b>\$9,651</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

**City of San Diego**

<b>MPO ID:</b> SD88		<b>CAPACITY STATUS:</b> Exempt									
<b>TITLE:</b> I-5/SR 56 Interchange											
<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> Freeway to freeway interchange											
<b>Change Reason:</b> Move STP funds from PE to CON (reconfiguration related to opening of SR 56); add FY 2004 appropriations											
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>	
DEMO	\$1,375	\$300	\$75	\$1,000				\$1,375			
CBI	\$1,942	\$1,942						\$1,942			
Local Funds	\$561	\$561						\$561			
STP*	\$1,500		\$1,500							\$1,500	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$5,378</b>	<b>\$2,803</b>	<b>\$1,575</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>				<b>\$3,878</b>		<b>\$1,500</b>	
*Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed FY 2003 appropriations)											
<i>PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT</i>											
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>	
DEMO	\$300	\$300						\$300			
CBI	\$1,942	\$1,942						\$1,942			
Local Funds	\$561	\$561						\$561			
STP	\$1,500		\$1,500					\$1,500			
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$4,303</b>	<b>\$2,803</b>	<b>\$1,500</b>					<b>\$4,303</b>			

**Table 1**  
**2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment No. 18**  
**San Diego Region (in \$000s)**

**City of Santee**

<b>MPO ID:</b>	SNT02		<b>CAPACITY STATUS:</b>					CI		
<b>TITLE:</b>	Forester Creek Channelization									
<b>DESCRIPTION:</b>	Construct new flood control channel along Forester Creek (in coordination with SR-52 New Freeway project)									
<b>Change Reason:</b>	Revise funds between fiscal years									
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
RSTP	\$10,166			\$2,966	\$7,200				\$2,966	\$7,200
Local Funds	\$7,384	\$3,868	\$2,616		\$900			\$2,844	\$484	\$4,056
TransNet-H	\$6,800				\$2,900	\$3,900				\$6,800
Water Bond	\$4,750	\$4,750						\$200	\$4,550	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$29,100</b>	<b>\$8,618</b>	<b>\$2,616</b>	<b>\$2,966</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$3,900</b>		<b>\$3,044</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>	<b>\$18,056</b>
<i>PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT</i>										
<b>FUND TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PRIOR</b>	<b>02/03</b>	<b>03/04</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>RW</b>	<b>CON</b>
RSTP	\$10,166			\$10,166					\$966	\$9,200
Local Funds	\$7,375	\$4,077	\$2,616	\$682				\$2,844	\$267	\$4,264
TransNet-L	\$810	\$200	\$275	\$335				\$200		\$610
Water Bond	\$4,768	\$4,768								\$4,768
TransNet-H	\$6,800			\$6,800						\$6,800
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$29,919</b>	<b>\$9,045</b>	<b>\$2,891</b>	<b>\$17,983</b>				<b>\$3,044</b>	<b>\$1,233</b>	<b>\$25,642</b>

## RTIP Fund Types

BTA	=	Bicycle Transportation Account (State)
CMAQ	=	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Federal)
CBI	=	Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program (Federal)
CDBG	=	Community Development Block Grants (Local)
DEMO	=	Demonstration (Federal)
HBRR	=	Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement (Federal)
IBRC	=	Innovative Bridge Research & Construction (Federal)
JARC	=	Jobs Access Reverse Commute (Federal)
PLH	=	Public Lands Highway (Federal)
RSTP	=	Regional Surface Transportation Program (Federal)
RTP	=	Recreational Trails Program (Federal)
SHOPP	=	State Highway Operation & Protection Program (for Caltrans use only)
STIP-IIP	=	State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (State)
STIP-RIP	=	State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (State)
STP	=	Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed FY 2003 appropriations)
TCI	=	Transit Capital Improvement Program (State, no longer exists)
TCRP	=	Traffic Congestion Relief Program (State)
TCSP	=	Transportation & Community & System Preservation (Federal)
TSM	=	Transportation Systems Management (State)
TDA	=	Transportation Development Act (State)
TDA-B	=	Transportation Development Act-Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities (State)
TEA	=	Transportation Enhancement Activities Program (Federal)
<i>TransNet-H</i>	=	Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Highway (Local)
<i>TransNet-L</i>	=	Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets & Roads (Local)
<i>TransNet-T</i>	=	Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit (Local)
Section 5307	=	Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program
Section 5309	=	Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program
Section 5309 NS	=	Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program
Section 5309 FG	=	Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization (Rail Mod)
Section 5311	=	Federal Transit Administration Rural Program
Section 5310	=	Federal Transit Administration Elderly & Disabled Program

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **4**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## JOBS ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC)/AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT (APCD) – FUNDED TRANSIT SERVICE

### **Introduction**

In July 2002, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) applied for funding (through SANDAG) from both the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and the Federal Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) program to operate and market Route 830, a reverse-commute service between Downtown San Diego / Mid-City and the Poway Business Park. MTDB won both grants and, as a result of consolidation, SANDAG now has \$200,000 to operate the service.

Route 830 addresses a gap in service identified by two previous Welfare-to-Work Transit Studies (1999/2003) and the regional Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP, 2003). The new reverse-commute service, shown in Attachment 1, would connect the transit dependent residents of downtown San Diego, Mid-City, and the South Bay to the Poway Business Park with northbound trips in the morning peak period and southbound trips in the afternoon peak period. The new service would cut existing transit travel time between Downtown San Diego and the Poway Business Park from more than two hours (local service with transfers) to just under an hour (direct, limited-stop service).

Approval today would authorize the implementation of Route 830 as a two-year trial service starting in July 2004 using the awarded grant funds. After the two-year trial, SANDAG would need to determine whether or not to maintain the service based on service performance and available funding.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee authorize the use of the awarded APCD and JARC funding to implement Route 830 beginning in July 2004. The two-year trial service would be operated by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) using \$100,000 in APCD grant funds and \$100,000 in federal JARC funds.

### **Discussion**

#### *Background*

In 1999 and 2003, MTDB commissioned Welfare-to-Work Transit Studies to identify the transportation needs of low-income and CalWorks participants. Analysis of the geographic distribution of employment and CalWorks / low-income housing clusters identified gaps in transit access between major employment areas and CalWorks heavy communities. In particular, these studies found that transit travel time to the Poway Business Park took an excessive amount of time

from many low-income communities, and served as a barrier to employment opportunities in this job rich area.

As a result, MTDB staff began working with Poway businesses to determine the transportation needs of commuters accessing the Business Park area. In coordination with Poway's major employers, staff gathered origin-destination data for nearly 50 percent of the Business Park employees. These data revealed that 17 percent of the total employee base of 13,500 employees was coming from CalWork's dense areas in Mid-City, Downtown San Diego, and the South Bay. A review of existing transit services found that these employees faced one-way transit travel times of two to three hours to reach the Business Park. Based on these findings, staff began exploring opportunities to provide a new commuter express service to the Poway Business Park from these communities.

In 2002, the MTD Board of Directors authorized staff to pursue JARC and APCD funding, through SANDAG, for a new reverse-commute transit service from Downtown San Diego to Poway via Mid-City. SANDAG won \$100,000 in funding from both APCD and JARC for two years of marketing and operations. With regional transit service planning now the responsibility of SANDAG, the authorization for implementing this service falls to the Transportation Committee.

***Service Concept***

Route 830 would operate between Downtown San Diego and the Poway Business Park via the Interstate 15 (I-15) Transit Plazas at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard in Mid-City. The route would serve the communities of Downtown San Diego, Mid-City, and the South Bay (via Trolley connections), connecting with the major transit transfer centers in Downtown San Diego and along I-15 (offering transit connections to and from other parts of the region). The following table outlines the demographics of the populations that would be served by the proposed Route 830 service.

<b>Communities Served by Route 830</b>		
<b>Community</b>	<b>% Households under \$15,000</b>	<b>CalWorks Participants</b>
Mid City	24 %	4,430
Downtown	36 %	3,300
South Bay	16 %	3,500

Implementation of Route 830 would cut transit travel time to the Poway Business Park by one to one-and-a-half hours for residents of the greater Downtown San Diego and South Bay communities, making the Business Park much more accessible to transit dependents residing in these communities.



*Schedule*

Route 830 would provide three morning and three evening trips to the Poway Business Park, coinciding with the primary start and end times of Business Park employees. Based on surveys of current transit riders and the top 20 employers within the Poway Business Park, the primary start and end times were identified to be between 7:00-8:00 a.m. and 4:00 –5:30 p.m., respectively. The following schedule was developed based on the start/end-time data and coordination with MTS staff:

<b>Route 830 Proposed Schedule</b>		
<b>AM</b>		
<b>Downtown</b>	<b>I-15/University</b>	<b>Poway Business Park</b>
5:44a	5:54	6:40
6:11a	6:21	7:07
6:51a	7:01	7:47
<b>PM</b>		
<b>Poway Business Park</b>	<b>I-15/University</b>	<b>Downtown</b>
3:37p	4:32	4:42
4:07p	5:02	5:12
5:37p	6:32	6:42

*Better Utilization of Existing Resources*

An added benefit of this new service is that it will enable SANDAG and MTS to better utilize existing resources. Currently, many of our commuter buses that provide peak direction commuter service between North County suburbs and Downtown San Diego drive more than 20 miles out of service to reach their start points for peak direction service. Since these vehicles are incurring operating costs without picking up passengers, these out-of-service vehicle miles greatly increase the cost of providing service.

Route 830 service will convert existing out-of-service miles into revenue service. This conversion will better utilize existing driver pay hours and revenue miles. As a result of this resource optimization, the marginal cost of providing Route 830 (\$3.50/revenue mile) is lower than the commuter express contract rate of \$6.11/revenue mile.

*Fare*

Route 830 service would operate in mixed traffic with ten stops outside Downtown San Diego. Based on these service characteristics, we recommend a fare rate of \$2.50, which is equivalent to existing Express Routes 30, 50, and 150, which provide similar service.

***Implementation Steps***

Route 830 is scheduled to launch in summer 2004. Prior to implementation, the following issues will need to be resolved. A time schedule appears in the table below.

- **Fare Policy Change.** MTS will need to update its existing Fare Ordinance by June 2004 to include the \$2.50 fare rate for the Route 830 commuter service.
- **Bus Stop Improvements.** Four new bus stop locations have been identified in the Poway Business Park for this service. Concrete passenger pads and connecting sidewalks will need to be constructed prior to service implementation in July 2004. The City of Poway has agreed to construct these stops using its Transportation Development Act (TDA) reserve funds.
- **Execution of APCD Grant Contract.** Upon SANDAG Transportation Committee authorization of Route 830 service implementation, staff will execute the contract with APCD for the awarded grant monies (May 2004).
- **Fund Transfer to MTS.** SANDAG will allocate \$200,000 in grant operating funds to MTS for operations of Route 830 for FY 05 and FY 06 (FY 05 funding to be included in the MTS FY 05 operating budget).
- **Marketing/Outreach.** MTS and SANDAG will work together to develop a marketing plan for the new Route 830 service. Staff will follow successful marketing plans used for the JARC-funded Routes 905 and 960, including outreach to local planning groups, collaboration with local job placement facilities and community centers, ads in the MTS newsletter, Take Ones onboard transit vehicles, and information booths at local street fairs.

Item	Expected Completion Date
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL	4/16/03
BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS	May-July 2004
EXECUTION OF CONTRACT WITH APCD	May 2004
FUND TRANSFER TO MTS	June 2004
MTS FARE ORDINANCE REVISION	May-June 2004
MARKETING/OUTREACH	May-September 2004
ROUTE LAUNCH DATE	July 2004

BOB LEITER  
 Director of Transportation and Land Use Planning

The Attachment to this Agenda Item is available in hard copy only and may be obtained by contacting SANDAG's Clerk of the Board at (619) 699-1912.

Key Staff Contact: Paul Davis (619) 557-4559; paul.davis@sdmts.com

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

**Action Requested: RECOMMEND**

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (NCTD) WITH RESPECT TO SPRINTER FINANCING

## **Introduction**

Due to the suspension of Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), the SANDAG Board on March 26, 2004 approved programming funds to be used for the reimbursement of interest payments and the full \$80 million should the TCRP funds not materialize. The action included programming funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) which requires approval by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). As an alternate plan, funds from Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program would be programmed should the CTC deny the request. The proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with NCTD and SANDAG memorializes this action.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute an MOU with NCTD for funding the Sprinter if TCRP funds do not materialize.

## **Discussion**

NCTD is currently undertaking the construction and implementation of the Sprinter Rail Project linking the Cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido. Revenues committed to complete the project consist of a combination of federal, state, and local funding. The federal commitment of \$152.1 million is in the form of a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). As a prerequisite to the FFGA, a financial plan was submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which demonstrated a fully funded project. One element in the financial plan was an \$80 million contribution from the state's TCRP consistent with Assembly Bill (AB) 2928. As well, an application for the \$80 million was approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in August 2001, and an allocation request submitted to the CTC in November 2002 is on a pending allocation list. As you are aware, funding for the TCRP program has been reduced significantly over the past two years and decisions on FY 2005 apportionments are still pending. As a result, the CTC has halted all decisions on TCRP allocations.

In order to proceed with the timely construction of the project, NCTD has researched various financing options and proposes to issue debt to fund the cash shortfall created by the suspension of the TCRP funds. A request was made to SANDAG to program funds for the interest and the

principal on the \$80 million in an amount not to exceed \$105 million, if deemed necessary. The SANDAG Board approved programming funding from the STIP. at its March 26, 2004, Board meeting. The action taken by the Board, which included use of the STIP funding, is dependant upon approval by the CTC. Should the CTC deny the use of the STIP funding, CMAQ funds would be the alternate solution. In order to assist NCTD in establishing a positive credit rating needed for the debt, an MOU between NCTD and SANDAG memorializing this action is necessary.

The MOU, to be distributed at the meeting, will describe the obligations and responsibilities for each agency.

Significant points of the proposed agreement are as follows:

- NCTD will undertake the construction of the project.
- NCTD will make the debt service payments using its share of local dollars (i.e., *TransNet*, Transportation Development Act (TDA), farebox, and/or other revenue) in FY 2005-2007.
- NCTD will adhere at all times to the provisions of the FFGA.
- NCTD shall submit quarterly and annual reports to the SANDAG Executive Director detailing the status of the construction, the schedule, percentage of project completion, budget status and projections, pending or threatened litigation, and other relevant information.
- SANDAG shall annually program, beginning in FY 2008 and through FY 2017 if necessary, STIP or CMAQ funds in the amount necessary to make scheduled interest and principal (up to the \$105 million) payments.

In the event that TCRP or other funds become available to fund all or a portion of the \$80 million, plus interest, SANDAG's obligation to program CMAQ funds will be reduced proportionately.

This proposed action will allow the Sprinter project construction and start-up to continue on schedule while awaiting decisions on future state dollars. Delay of the construction could result in increased costs far outweighing the cost of financing. The action taken by the SANDAG Board on March 26, 2004, was a result of a recommendation by the Transportation Committee and demonstrates the positive effects of consolidation.

ELLEN ROUNDTREE  
Director of Governmental Relations

Key Staff Contact: Ellen Roundtree, (619) 699-6960; [ero@sandag.org](mailto:ero@sandag.org)

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **6**

**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA)  
PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

## **Introduction**

This quarterly progress report covers the period January to March 2004 for the nine federal TEA program funded projects. Two projects are complete and the remaining seven projects are progressing according to their approved schedules.

## **Discussion**

In March 2000 the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the allocation of TEA funds to nine projects and directed the Transportation Committee to receive progress reports on a quarterly basis. Listed below are the nine TEA projects. Attachment 1 contains a description of each project, progress made to date, and any pending issues.

- City of San Diego: Mid-City Gateway Project
- Cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach: Silver Strand Improvements
- Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Solana Beach: Coastal Rail Trail
- San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB): San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center
- Cities of Encinitas and Escondido: Biological Core & Linkage Area Habitat Acquisition
- County of San Diego: Escondido Creek Acquisition
- MTDB: East Village Intermodal Transit Station Improvements
- City of San Diego: Mission Beach Boardwalk – **Completed**
- City of La Mesa: El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization – **Completed**

Photos of completed projects are posted on the TEA web page of the SANDAG Web site: [www.sandag.org\TEA](http://www.sandag.org\TEA).

**AB 1012: "Use-It-Or-Lose-It"**

The TEA program, along with the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), is subject to the timely use of funds provision of Assembly Bill (AB) 1012. Regions are required to obligate a minimum amount of funds in each program or be subject to reprogramming. Based on the latest Caltrans progress report for the TEA program, the San Diego region has obligated over \$21.9 million in TEA funds as of March 2004, which is well above the minimum obligation requirement.

The next TEA quarterly report will be presented at the July 2004 Transportation Committee meeting.

RENÉE WASMUND  
Director of Finance

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909; [ski@sandag.org](mailto:ski@sandag.org)

**TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA)  
PROGRAM QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT  
JANUARY TO MARCH 2004**

**City of San Diego: Mid-City Gateway Project (\$4,255,000 TEA Funds)**

The project provides for overpass and median enhancements on El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue where the two east-west major arterials intersect with State Route 15 (SR 15) freeway corridor (formally 40<sup>th</sup> Street in Mid-City).

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (El Cajon Boulevard from Interstate 15 (I-15)/Central to 43<sup>rd</sup> Street Median Improvements) is complete and open for public use. Phase 2 (El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue Bridge Decks over SR 15 from 39<sup>th</sup> Street to 41<sup>st</sup> Street) is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- Received Caltrans Encroachment permit.
- Advertised and received construction bids for Phase 2.

Pending Issues: The City is reviewing the current low bidder's disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) goal and its good faith effort. In addition, the City received a protest related to the same bidder. The City anticipates about a two-month delay in contract award but is confident that the December opening date schedule will be met.

**Cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach: Silver Strand Improvements (\$1,310,560 TEA Funds)**

This project creates defining gateways at both of the north and south entrances of the Silver Strand Scenic Highway (SR 75) as well as a restored, functional coastal ecosystem. The North Gateway corridor segment encompasses 1.5-miles of SR 75, from the Naval Amphibious Base south, and the South Gateway corridor encompasses two miles from Emory Cove south to Rainbow Drive in Imperial Beach. It includes enhancement of the area surrounding the bicycle/pedestrian path, bicycle path improvements connecting Imperial Beach to the Bayshore Bikeway, median enhancements, historic landscape restoration, and gateway signage.

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (SR 75 enhancement) is complete and open for public use. Phase 2 (the Bayshore Bikeway spur) received a schedule extension in January 2004 due to the high cost of the construction bid and permitting issues. Progress made during this quarter includes:

- Cities and Caltrans have worked to resolve the permitting issues resulting in some changes to the aesthetic design.

Pending Issues: Once the permitting issues are resolved, the cities anticipate rebidding the contract in the summer.

**Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Solana Beach: Coastal Rail Trail (\$4,513,500 TEA Funds)**

This project includes the design and construction of a 16-foot-wide multimodal path in the San Diego Northern Railway right-of-way between the San Luis Rey River in the City of Oceanside and the southerly city limit of the City of Solana Beach (approximately 17.6 miles). The right-of-way is owned by the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD). Progress to date, by jurisdiction, includes:

City of Carlsbad (Phase 1): Tamarack Avenue to Oak Avenue

- Completed Phase 1 Plan, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) for review by NCTD.
- Received permit from the Coastal Commission and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) approvals.
- Submitted variance request to NCTD to allow for more room for the bike trail within the rail corridor.

Phase 2 (Carlsbad Village Station to Carlsbad Boulevard; Tamarack Avenue to Poinsettia Coaster Station) schedule is not known at this time.

City of Encinitas

- Discontinued PS&E development as the City works with NCTD to discuss trail plans within the rail right-of-way.

City of Oceanside (Phase 1): Vista Way to Pacific Street

- Awarded Phase 1 construction contract.

Phase 2 (Oceanside Boulevard to Oceanside Transit Center to Neptune Way) schedule is not known at this time.

City of Solana Beach

- Began construction of rail trail.

Pending Issues: NCTD issued its operations "right-of-way exhibits," which outline areas where the rail trail can be developed within the rail corridor. Unfortunately, some of the exhibits are too restrictive for a trail development. The cities have submitted requests for variance and are working with NCTD to resolve some of these issues.

**MTDB: San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Station (\$1,895,000 TEA Funds)**

This project provides improvements to the existing San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station. The enhancements include the creation of a pedestrian plaza to serve the Trolley station and the



San Ysidro-Puerto Mexico Port of Entry, as well as revisions to vehicular circulation patterns to establish designated bus, taxi, and jitney/shuttle bus passenger boarding areas.

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (pedestrian bridge and new General Services Administration [GSA] parking lot) is complete and open for use. Phase 2 (pedestrian plaza, rail court modifications, track relocation, and new bus bays) is ongoing, and progress to date for Phase 2 includes:

- Northbound Track/East Station Platform: Completed excavation of track bed, installation of drainage facilities, and the construction of the catenary and lighting foundations.
- Trolley switched over to newly completed northbound track.

Pending Issues: MTDB continues to negotiate with private property owners regarding the appraised value of their properties (settled with one property owner).

#### **Cities of Encinitas and Escondido: Biological Core & Linkage Area Habitat Acquisition (\$1,800,000 TEA Funds)**

This project involves the purchase of habitat along Interstate 5 (I-5). Escondido initially planned to purchase 51 acres north of Lake Hodges, but an opportunity to purchase a much larger property arose. Escondido's share of the \$1 million in TEA funds was used to help purchase a 50-acre portion (out of 232 acres) of the Bernardo Mountain property in cooperation with the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. The acquisition cost at \$2,951,693 was completed in September 2002.

Encinitas' plan to purchase approximately 10 acres immediately south of Batiquitos Lagoon is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- Site A (Encinitas): Appraisals and environmental assessments have been completed for three parcels. Escrow closed on the largest property on July 12, 2002. Owners of two smaller parcels have not responded to attempts at further negotiation.

Pending Issues: City plans to confirm that the owners of the remaining property are no longer interested in selling the property. Once confirmed, the City plans to close out the project.

#### **County of San Diego: Escondido Creek Acquisition (\$2,000,000 TEA Funds)**

The project consists of the purchase of valuable habitat land along the Escondido Creek riparian corridor, located in the Escondido Creek watershed in the unincorporated area of San Diego County.

The project is divided into two phases. Phase 1 (initial purchase of 31.53 acres) was completed in June 2002. Phase 2 (purchase of additional 64 acres) is ongoing, and progress to date includes:

- County continues to work with Escondido Creek Conservancy (for up to 76.1 acres) including conducting hazardous material surveys.

Pending Issues: None

**MTDB: East Village Intermodal Transit Station Improvement (\$4,584,000 TEA Funds)**

This project is a part of a larger project along the Twelfth Avenue/Park Boulevard corridor and the new downtown baseball park station along the Bayside corridor. The enhancements include improved passenger access, widened platforms, street and curb improvements, station amenities, decorative catenary poles, and other aesthetic improvements at four station locations. Progress to date includes:

- Gaslamp Station is complete and open for use.
- Continue construction for Park-to-Bay Link stations (12<sup>th</sup> and Market and Twelfth Avenue improvements).

Pending Issues: None.

**City of San Diego: Mission Beach Boardwalk Project (\$1,186,000 TEA Funds)**

This project is complete. This project widened and improved the busy boardwalk in Mission Beach, which included among other improvements landscaping between Santa Barbara Place and Pacific Beach Drive, totaling 1.14 miles.

**City of La Mesa: El Cajon Boulevard Revitalization (\$1,565,194 TEA Funds)**

This project is complete. This project revitalized part of downtown La Mesa via construction of a one-mile section of landscaped median along El Cajon Boulevard and the construction of a gateway sign located west of City of La Mesa limits.

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004.

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **7**

**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF TRADE AND GOODS MOVEMENT BETWEEN CALIFORNIA AND BAJA CALIFORNIA, MEXICO (MAQUILADORA SURVEY)

### **Introduction**

Caltrans funded the Survey and Analysis of Trade and Goods Movement between California and Baja California, Mexico, with the goal of developing strategies to reduce commercial traffic congestion at the California-Mexico border and to make the most efficient use of border infrastructure. The study included a survey of the *maquiladora* plants and other firms that generate significant cross-border truck traffic entering the San Diego region, as well as other agencies such as freight forwarders and brokers. This project also surveyed trucks at the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay, Tecate-Tecate, and Calexico-Mexicali ports of entry to determine the destination of trade and goods entering the U.S. from Mexico, updating a survey last done in 1996.

The Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) discussed this study at its October and November 2003 meetings. The study, with additional comments from COBRO, was brought to the Borders Committee in December 2003 when it was accepted and recommended to be presented to the Transportation Committee as an information item.

### **Discussion**

Transportation infrastructure in the border region is critical to both Mexico and the United States. Otay Mesa, our region's main commercial port of entry, is the third busiest commercial crossing in trade value and second in the number of truck crossings along the U.S.-Mexico border. In 2003, 698,228 commercial trucks crossed through the Otay Mesa Port of Entry, while a total of 1,022,949 commercial trucks came through all six ports of entry in the California/Baja California border region. It is estimated that with the construction of the Toyota plant in the eastern portion of Tijuana the factory will send 160 trucks per day through the Otay Mesa Port of Entry.

The Survey and Analysis of Trade and Goods Movement between California and Baja California, Mexico (Attachment 1 - Maquiladora Survey) conducted by Science Application International Technology (SAIC) on behalf of Caltrans, recommends the following actions:

- Road infrastructure improvements
- Dedicated lanes for expedited processes
- Increased inspection agency staffing, resource management, and use of technology
- Longer and more flexible operating hours
- Binational, interagency cooperation
- Documentation of cost of delays

As the study was done in June 2003, the Borders Committee accepted that these additional comments be submitted to Caltrans:

- Stress that State Route (SR) 905 is one of the priorities for the region;
- Recognize that southbound trucking is more than a local issue and needs to be funded accordingly;
- Extend the current Customs trial period of extended hours at the Otay Mesa Port of Entry from one month to three months; and
- Establish competitive wait times of no longer than one hour in both north and southbound directions.

SANDAG coordinates a number of comprehensive planning efforts to improve border transportation and infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border. This study, along with SANDAG's Crossborder Transportation Modeling, are the type of critical data needed to help formulate strategies and create policies to improve the flow of commercial traffic at the ports of entry and make better use of existing infrastructure.

BOB LEITER

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; [jcl@sandag.org](mailto:jcl@sandag.org)

**SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF TRADE AND  
GOODS MOVEMENT BETWEEN  
CALIFORNIA  
AND BAJA CALIFORNIA, MEXICO**

Prepared For:



**San Diego Association of Governments  
401B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(619) 595-5300**

**FINAL REPORT  
JUNE 2003**

Prepared By:



**Science Applications International Corporation  
4242 Campus Point Court  
San Diego, CA 92121  
(858) 826-9307**

SANDAG Project Number: 0220900

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California/Baja California international border is one of the most dynamic regions in the world. Tens of thousands of people cross the border each day to go to school, shop or go to work. Thousands of trucks pass daily through the commercial crossings at Tecate, Otay Mesa, and Calexico headed for points across the nation. California's border crossings with Baja California have become among the most traveled and the most congested of those along the U.S./Mexico border.

Since the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, the country's ports of entry (POEs) have come under increasing scrutiny as to their ability to protect the nation from the illegal entry of people and contraband, particularly those posing terrorist threats. These new circumstances have made the traditional act of balancing trade flow with adequate inspection even more challenging.

Over the years, a number of government agencies, non-profit organizations and academic institutions have studied the California/Mexico border in an attempt to document delays and border inefficiencies. This information plays a part in seeking solutions to border problems.

The Survey and Analysis of Trade and Goods Movement Between California and Baja California, Mexico, sponsored by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), was undertaken to shed new light on the commercial border crossing issues of the region and to collect valuable information not previously available. This unprecedented project was designed to assess cross-border shipping patterns among the key private sector stakeholders in binational commerce: maquiladoras (assembly only); maquiladoras (manufacturers); customs brokers; non-agricultural shippers (definitive importers); agricultural shippers (produce importers/exporters); and transportation companies. The goal of the study was to survey these sectors to determine their experience and concerns regarding border-crossing delays at Otay Mesa, Calexico, and Tecate, and to develop a reliable source of data to be used in supporting recommendations for improvements to border transportation infrastructure or federal inspection procedures. It was hoped that the data collected might help decision makers develop workable incentives or measures that would encourage shippers to alter the times that they ship, hence reducing congestion.

In August 2002, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) was selected to perform the study. The SAIC Project Team was composed of cross-border experts in the areas of import-export, economics/statistics, transportation and cross-border planning. From October 2002 to December 2002, 120 companies distributed among the six categories listed above were interviewed in the cities of Tijuana/San Diego, Tecate, Mexicali, and Ensenada. A three-person team completed the surveys with a combination of contacts made in person, by fax, and by phone. Companies who shipped a minimum of five times per week were considered relevant for the purposes of the study.

The 27-question survey instrument was composed of three key sections: inbound shipments; outbound shipments; and a management section designed to capture general comments and concerns regarding border crossing delays and infrastructure improvements. "Inbound" and "outbound" shipments refer to shipments to and from a given facility. While in many cases, these terms can be interchangeable with

“northbound” and “southbound,” this is not always the case. The survey was therefore structured as inbound and outbound to facilitate responses.

The survey was designed to measure data such as types of products shipped, frequency of shipments, the border crossing most frequently used, and the types of vehicles used to transport products.

The survey results constitute the bulk of this report. The findings are presented in the form of graphs and charts, supported in many cases by text. For the most part, summaries are provided only for the questions that received sufficient responses to be meaningful. Among the key findings from the inbound and outbound segments of the survey are:

- The majority of the goods crossing the border that are received inbound to facilities in Mexico are shipped by trailer, as opposed to containers or other types;
- Of the groups surveyed, customs brokers handle the largest volume of daily inbound shipments (almost 80 per day on average);
- 34 percent of outbound shipments head to destinations in Southern California, which is the top destination for these shipments; and
- Customs brokers handle the greatest number of outbound shipments per day (over 50).

Regarding the general management section of the survey, some interesting observations can be made:

- The majority of companies ship at times dictated by the schedules of their customers or their own production schedule, rather than for minimization of travel time or port congestion;
- The majority of respondents (63%) have learned to operate satisfactorily with the current hours of operation at all three commercial ports between California and Baja California;
- Most companies surveyed stated that it takes an average of two to three hours to cross the border at the port of entry most frequently used; and that anything beyond one hour is considered an “excessive wait;”
- Infrastructure improvements are needed to facilitate border crossing, particularly at the Otay Mesa Port of Entry; and
- Nearly two-thirds of all respondents said that they would not make any changes in the way they operate if delays continue or worsen. However, 45% of the respondents grouped as “shippers” indicated they would change their operational procedures if delays continue or worsen. The top three responses for addressing further delays were: (1) Change hours of operation; (2) Switch to a different border crossing; (3) Change shipping schedules.

## Recommendations

Based on the analysis conducted of all survey elements, combined with direct observations and experiences of the study team members, the following recommendations can be made:

***Performance Monitoring.*** Most border inspection agencies measure traffic volume, entries processed, inspections performed, and inspection results. Few measure processing times and associated waiting times for drivers and cargo. Strategic goals of the Border and Transportation Security Directorate include improving border security, while at the same time facilitating the unimpeded and reliable flow of commerce and people through the ports of entry. Without appropriate performance measures, agencies have no way of knowing how well they are moving safe and legal vehicles, drivers, and cargo and are unable to identify opportunities for improvement. Currently available technologies can be used to implement performance measures for traffic flows without compromising either proprietary data (for shippers) or sensitive law enforcement information (for inspection agencies). ***Inspection agencies and transportation agencies should develop and implement effective performance measures and standards for these measures, as well as monitor and report results on a regular basis.*** These performance measures should include:

- Total time to cross the border from the time the vehicle enters the first processing queue on one side of the border until it is released on the other side of the border (stratified by type of process – e.g., Border Release Advanced Screening and Selectivity [BRASS], formal, agricultural, informal, empty truck, HAZMAT) so that border agencies and shippers monitor processing time performance and transportation agencies can identify where delays are occurring and allocate resources appropriately to make needed improvements.
- Numbers of vehicles processed by location, type of process, and hour of day so that both shippers and inspection agencies know when processing volumes are greatest and inspection agencies can tailor hours of operation to accommodate changing demand patterns. At the same time, this will enable shippers, brokers and transportation companies to modify their shipping schedules to take advantage of less congested crossing times.
- Number of primary gates operating by hour of day and day of week so that agencies and shippers have a better understanding of how border crossing times are affected by the way agencies allocate staff resources.

Performance measures reported to shippers and other private sector entities should not include any information about inspection times, inspection rates, inspection selection criteria, inspection methods, or levels of compliance. All of this information is considered law enforcement sensitive and should be treated accordingly.

***Road Infrastructure Improvements.*** Studies have been conducted to investigate the specific needs for road improvements on both sides of the border, with particular emphasis on highways and roads leading to the border crossings.



Road improvements are particularly needed at Otay Mesa (both sides of the border) due to the high and growing volume of commercial cargo traffic and the high value cargo crossing the border at that location. The challenge for government authorities on both sides of the border will be to secure the necessary funding to make improvements. Coupled with enhancements to operating policies, **a more balanced investment in road infrastructure could improve the cross border flow of commercial cargo.**

*Dedicated Lanes for Expedited Processes.* In most ports of entry, inspection agencies have established dedicated primary gates for empty trucks and for entries participating in an expedited processing program (e.g., BRASS). Through BRASS and similar programs, the former U.S. Customs developed and implemented means for expediting movement of low risk cargo into the U.S. with minimum delay. However, in most cases, the lanes leading to primary gates where expedited processing occurs are not controlled nor is there any way to separate empty trucks that participate in the expedited system from the rest of the vehicles. Unfortunately, during periods of peak congestion, the vehicles that participate in an expedited processing program experience significant waiting because of the long lines prior to primary processing. **Whenever possible, local, state, and federal agencies should find ways to provide dedicated lanes of sufficient length to allow empty and expedited processing cargo to move quickly to the dedicated primary processing gates without waiting behind formal and informal entries that will need more time at primary and in the cargo compound.** Implementation of this process may require significant traffic management using either technology or personnel (but not necessarily inspectors) to ensure that drivers remain in designated lanes. In addition, the expedited processing programs should be expanded to increase the number of firms enrolled.

*Increased Inspection Agency Staffing and Resource Management, Including the Use of Technology.* With current concerns about homeland security, inspection agency personnel have an enormous responsibility to protect the U.S. from terrorists that would bring weapons of mass destruction (WMD) into the U.S. hidden in trucks, shipping containers, or cargo entering the U.S. through seaports, airports, and land border crossings. Because of this situation, state and federal inspection agency personnel are stretched to their limits inspecting more trucks and cargo. Inspection agencies have done a remarkable job fulfilling these responsibilities. In some cases, this increased inspection activity reduces staff available for regular cargo processing activities. **Inspection agencies need adequate personnel to staff as many primary gates as necessary to keep trucks and cargo moving efficiently across the border and to process entries (document review, research, and inspection) inside the cargo compounds on both sides of the border.**

Along with this increase in staffing, agency managers need better tools to manage resources so that they know how best to allocate available personnel to optimize their use in primary gate processing and cargo inspection activities to ensure effective cargo review and inspection and efficient flow of vehicles and cargo to, into, and through the compound. Tools do exist to track real time workload movement, such as PASS (Primary Access Security System) developed in El Paso, which through the use of pass cards, enables inspectors to monitor the overall status of the compound. **Real-time resource allocation tools should be developed to allow a more efficient allocation of inspectors**

**and technology where they are needed most as dictated by workload requirements.**

Longer and More Flexible Operating Hours. While most (63%) of brokers, shippers, and transportation companies have adapted to current operating hours, 37% expressed a desire for either different or longer operating hours. Of the 37%, 13% want 24/7 operations so that they can reduce their border crossing delays by taking advantage of less congested periods. **Inspection agencies and other entities involved in border crossing processes (financial institutions, brokers, and shippers) should consider expanding hours of operation or modifying time of day restrictions on the types of vehicles and entries allowed into cargo compounds to provide greater flexibility to shippers and transportation companies** that must move cargo across the border. These time of day restrictions are on a port-by-port basis and are determined by port directors in consultation with others. Restrictions depend on resources, demand, facilities, etc., and are negotiated or determined based on overall needs and capabilities. In the case of Otay Mesa, for example, from 6:00 am to 7:00 am, only empty vehicles are processed. BRASS and informal/formal entries (as well as empties) are processed later throughout the day. Changes in operating hours will necessarily affect personnel and other resource requirements so this recommendation must be considered along with recommended increases in staffing and technology for inspection agencies.

Bi-National, Interagency Cooperation. At many border-crossing locations, Customs officials on both sides of the border have excellent working relationships and keep each other informed of events or activities that will affect border-crossing traffic. For example, Customs officials from both sides of the border at Otay Mesa meet monthly to address issues. However, this coordination and cooperation is largely *ad hoc* and depends on relationships among agency managers. **Border management can be improved if this interaction were institutionalized so that border agencies had greater information about approaching traffic and planned events that may affect traffic flow.** This can be accomplished through technology (e.g., shared traffic data, television cameras), routine communications, and other techniques designed to keep agencies informed and allow them to coordinate activities. This coordination activity should be extended to state and federal agencies on both sides of the border.

Cost of Delay. The primary problem encountered at the border is the amount of time needed to cross the border. While the most common response to the survey question of what delay would be considered excessive was one hour, the mean time required to complete all of the transactions necessary to cross the border, including traffic delays at or near the border and waiting times at the port of entry was approximately two hours. One can therefore conclude that respondents consider current processing times to be excessive. While most companies surveyed were unable to provide details on the financial impacts that border delays have on their bottom line, the delays at the border clearly do have financial costs because, in addition to delaying cargo movement, they tie up vehicles and drivers, both of which are costly resources to shippers and transportation providers. **Regional entities with interests in economic development and productivity should identify the economic impacts and costs of delay to justify investments that reduce or eliminate delays to shippers and promote efficient use of physical infrastructure and agency resources.**

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 16, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **8**

**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## TRANSIT OPERATOR FY 2004 AND FIVE-YEAR PRELIMINARY PROJECTIONS AND TRENDS/CHALLENGES

### Introduction

As part of SANDAG's expanded role in the development of transit operator budgets, a series of budget items relating to transit operations has been scheduled through June 2004. In February, the Transportation Committee approved the FY 2005 transit operator guiding principles and objectives, and in March the transit operator revenue estimates were approved. This month's agenda item deals with FY 2004 year-end projections, as well as the five-year preliminary projections accompanied by a discussion of trends and challenges facing the transit operators. Future topics will consider preliminary FY 2005 Budget proposals, and issues related to developing a balance between fare revenue, subsidy revenue, expenses, and service levels.

### Discussion

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) offer many similar services as well as service aspects that are unique to their jurisdictions. Both entities provide fixed-route bus service, contracted bus services, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) service, and rail service. The makeup and cost structure of these activities can vary substantially between the two agencies, primarily due to the more urban nature of the MTS area relative to the intercity nature of the NCTD jurisdiction. Both entities face the challenge of maintaining a railroad right-of-way and of developing a balanced budget within the constraints of ridership trends and subsidy revenue. Cost pressures regarding energy, insurance, security, and staffing contribute to the challenge of developing a balanced budget while maximizing service levels.

Each year, as part of the budget cycle, transit operators provide mid-year updates to their approved budgets, and project revenue and expenses for the rest of the year. If budget amendments are necessary, they submit them to their respective Transit Boards for approval. This analysis becomes the new baseline for the preparation of the FY 2005 Budget. Attachment 1 contains NCTD's FY 04 year-end estimate as well as a discussion of trends and challenges and its five-year projections. Attachment 2 contains MTS's FY 04 year-end estimate (MTS Board Agenda Item No. 30 dated February 12, 2004) as well as a discussion of trends and challenges and its five-year projections (MTS Board Agenda Item No. 30 dated March 11, 2004).

Representatives from NCTD and MTS will be presenting oral reports covering this information.

RENÉE WASMUND  
Director of Finance

The Attachments to this Agenda Item are available in hard copy only and may be obtained by contacting SANDAG's Clerk of the Board at (619) 699-1912.

Key Staff Contact: Renee Wasmund, (619) 699-1940; rwa@sandag.org