

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

May 21, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

Meeting of May 7, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:09 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Chair Kellejian, the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the April 2 (as revised) and April 16, 2004, meetings. Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) abstained from the vote on the April 16, 2004, meeting minutes.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans, mentioned that the traffic congestion on Interstate 15 (I-15) this morning related to construction on the I-15 Managed Lane project. They were not able to open up the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes as early as they wanted to because the concrete didn't set fast enough. They were only able to open up one of the two lanes at about 7:00 a.m. and that took care of part of the problem.

### CONSENT ITEM (3)

3. **METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS) ROUTE 11 BUS STOP CONSOLIDATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (APPROVE)**

On January 19, 2004, SANDAG and San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) staff implemented a demonstration project on bus Route 11 that consolidated and eliminated bus stops along the route. This project was established to assess the effectiveness of a bus stop consolidation program in providing a cost-effective way to enhance transit reliability and travel speed. The results of this modest demonstration project indicate that there is potential to improve transit service through such programs. It is recommended that the SANDAG Transportation Committee receive this report for information and authorize staff to continue the bus stop consolidation program in partnership with the transit agencies on

other routes as appropriate. The results of this program will be reported to the Transportation Committee on a regular basis.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe (South County), the Transportation Committee unanimously approved Consent Item 3.

## REPORTS

### 4. 2004 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) - REVISED SUBMITTAL (RECOMMEND)

Staff reported that on March 26, 2004, the SANDAG Board approved Option C - Maximize GARVEE for submittal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). This option would allow funds to be available to projects when they need them with minimal schedule delays. The CTC has decided not to begin selecting projects for GARVEE bonding until after adoption of the 2004 STIP in August, and requested that the San Diego region submit an STIP option with a "pay-as-you-go" approach excluding the GARVEE bonds already approved. Option A completes the projects in the 2002 STIP and does not propose any additional GARVEE bond financing beyond those already issued for the I-15 Managed Lanes. However, there will be schedule delays and costs associated with the delays with this option. In the next several months, State Route (SR) 905 and SR 56 landscaping will be ready for construction. STIP funds and other funds may need to be programmed on these two projects if the CTC does not approve additional GARVEE bonds. However, staff does not recommend the programming of other funds at this time. Option A includes the alternative financing for the Sprinter using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. Staff requested that Option A be recommended to the SANDAG Board for approval as an initial submittal to the CTC. Staff will continue to work with the CTC on the GARVEE bond financing option.

The SANDAG Executive Director noted that he and the SANDAG Board Chair recently had an opportunity to meet with the CTC Executive Director and staff. They recommended that we submit our plan in two steps: first, the "pay-as-you-go" approach, and then continue to work on the GARVEE bond option. They agreed that both SR 905 and SR 52 were good projects and would be competitive for GARVEE bonding. The Executive Director referred to a memorandum from our legislative representative in Sacramento, Smith, Watts & Company, that indicates there is some positive movement on the transportation budget in terms of a subcommittee hearing held earlier this week. The state Administration may be flexible with regard to funding the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP). The issue is not so much as eliminating the program, but determining the amount of cash to keep the program going next fiscal year, which was estimated to be \$498 million. The amount we had submitted in terms of our need was about \$35 million. He believed this amount would be included in the overall TCRP amount. Staff will continue to keep the Committee apprised of activity related to this matter.

Mayor Corky Smith (North County Inland) asked when we will know what the Governor is going to do. *The Executive Director replied that the first thing is when the "May revise"*

*comes out next week. However, we won't have a definitive picture until the state budget is locked down. His best guess was that it would be sometime in July.*

Councilmember Madaffer asked about the payback source for GARVEE bonds. *The Executive Director responded that GARVEE bonds are paid back from future federal grant dollars. He noted that the Governor's mid-year proposal proposed \$800 million of new GARVEE bonding. This is a fraction of the state's \$3 billion capacity for GARVEE bonding. We have been polling our colleagues around the state to determine what other areas will be requesting GARVEE bonding. The two areas most interested in GARVEE bonding are San Diego and Los Angeles (the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Agency [LAMTA]). He added that Riverside, San Bernardino, and the Bay Area don't have projects that are ready to go. LAMTA has a much bigger program than we do. The second question is related to equity around the state.*

Councilmember Madaffer asked how much of the \$800 million is allocated in the state budget. *The Executive Director answered that none of that has been allocated.*

Councilmember Madaffer inquired about the total funding request contained in Option C. *Staff responded that it is \$250 million, which is well under the \$3 billion cap.* Councilmember Madaffer pointed out that there would still be bonding capacity available to other areas even if we were to get all that we requested.

Councilmember Madaffer moved approval of the staff's recommendation, but added a caveat that the Transportation Committee receives a monthly status report on this matter.

Leon Williams, MTS Chair, asked about the status of the \$17 million MTS bus procurement project. *The Executive Director replied that he believed that piece would be included in the \$498 million amount for the TCRP in FY 2004-05.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked about the interrelationship between the Sprinter financing and this request. *The Executive Director answered that we are not pursuing GARVEE bonding for the Sprinter. We are pursuing an alternative financing source for that project if we are not successful in obtaining the \$80 million in TCRP funds from the state.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked if Option A allowed the acquisition of right-of-way for SR 52 or whether that would be delayed. *Staff replied that Option A placed the acquisition of right-of-way for SR 52 ahead of SR 905 as SR 905 has higher prospects of obtaining GARVEE bonds.*

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that Option A of the 2004 STIP alternatives be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval so it may be submitted to the CTC. It was further recommended that in order to minimize potential project delays and cost increases, staff be directed to continue to pursue bond financing as outlined in Option C. Staff was also directed to provide a monthly status report to the Transportation Committee on this financial situation.

5. I-805/5 CORRIDOR STUDY AND SCREENING OF ALTERNATIVES (APPROVE)

Staff reported that SANDAG, in conjunction with Caltrans, is conducting a study to develop a transportation improvement strategy to enhance the mobility of interregional and regional trips for the entire Interstate 805 (I-805) corridor and the I-5 corridor south of SR 54. The purpose of this study is to identify multimodal transportation projects and services for corridor trips. The objectives are to increase capacity to move people and goods, provide travel choices for regional trips, sustain current travel times in mixed-use lanes in 2030, support transit and carpool travel times to major job centers that are competitive with driving alone, and to achieve a minimum 10 percent mode share for transit and 12 percent for carpools for work trips at peak periods.

Eight transportation alternatives were evaluated including different levels of regional transit services, different levels of highway improvements, and various types of highway improvements (HOV lanes, managed lanes, and mixed-flow lanes). Four alternatives are being recommended for further study: Alternative 1: No Build, Alternative 3: MOBILITY 2030 Transit and Highway, Alternative 5: Enhanced Transit - MOBILITY 2030 Highway, and Alternative 6: MOBILITY 2030 Transit – Enhanced Highway. Staff displayed the study area performance measures for each of the eight alternatives that included: people moved, travel time savings, congestion relief, share of work trips using alternative modes, and the ratio of capital cost and travel time savings. The next steps are to refine the travel forecasts, conduct an environmental constraints analysis, refine the performance measures, further evaluate the alternatives, and recommend a corridor improvement strategy.

Councilmember Emery stated that one of the alternatives has a northern appendage for transit and asked about its impact. Staff responded that Alternative 5 has transit service that is even beyond what is included in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan, and it has the most transit routes.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, questioned the various definitions of such terms as light rail, commuter rail, and heavy rail. He thought that it causes some confusion in the public's understanding of these terms. He mentioned several transportation Web sites that provided differing definitions for these terms. He expressed his strong support for Alternative 5: Enhanced Transit - MOBILITY 2030 Highway

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe expressed his agreement with Mr. Richard's comments. He conducted similar research and found that the general definitions revolve around whether a system deals with grade separations. In addition, some definitions indicate that if a system has a third rail, then it is considered "heavy rail," while light rail relates to a system that uses overhead energy.

Councilmember Jack Feller (North County Transit District [NCTD]) inquired as to why a "No Build" alternative was being considered. *The Executive Director responded that we are*

*required to study a wide range of alternatives, including doing nothing, to meet federal regulations and withstand legal challenges in the future.*

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation Committee approved the following four transportation alternatives to proceed for further study: Alternative 1: No Build, Alternative 3: MOBILITY 2030 Transit and Highway, Alternative 5: Enhanced Transit and MOBILITY 2030 Highway, and Alternative 6: MOBILITY 2030 Transit and Enhanced Highway.

Chair Kellejian noted that there was a late request to speak on agenda item 3. This will be heard following agenda item 6.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS ON SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS AND RELATED ITEMS (DISCUSSION)

Staff reported that this item is intended to bring the Transportation Committee up to date on the work of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and its Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups on the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). They have been working on three tasks associated with smart growth discussions in the draft RCP including: refining and expanding the smart growth area classifications to include seven general smart growth categories and developing a matrix that reflects the refined categories, preparing guidelines for strengthening the local/regional plan connection, and developing a framework for a smart growth incentive program that encourages smart growth development in appropriate locations.

Staff presented four principles for establishing smart growth incentive programs including: (1) regional funding for transportation investments that support smart growth, (2) regional funding for smart growth infrastructure and planning, (3) local incentives for smart growth, and (4) funding for other smart growth activities. Staff mentioned that the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) provided a comment that the principle related to infrastructure should include transit-related roadway improvements.

Staff reviewed the next steps which include the following: on May 24, the RPC and Working Groups will review the revised draft RCP; on May 28, the SANDAG Board will review the revised matrix, guidelines, principles for incentives, and key changes to the RCP; on June 4, the RPC meets to focus on housing; and on June 25, the SANDAG Board will certify the final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopt the final RCP.

Chair Kellejian thanked staff for this report. He said that it helps jurisdictions to have examples of the categories of projects in our communities. He noted one inconsistency between the agenda report and the PowerPoint presentation. On Page 7 under "Transit Corridor" the report lists 25-75 units per acre as opposed to the slide that indicated 20-75 units per acre. He asked which range was correct. *Staff replied that the 25-75 units per acre was the correct range.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked for the definition of smart growth. *Staff stated that smart growth refers to an urban form that concentrates growth within the existing urbanized area keeping in mind open space and rural areas. The purpose of smart growth is to focus*

*development around the existing infrastructure and make better use of the existing infrastructure.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe did not like the term “mixed use” in smart growth areas. He suggested that it refer to control mass and height in buildings and for staff to look at a density requirement rather than “mixed use.” *Staff stated that there are two kinds of mixed use: vertical and horizontal.* Supervisor Roberts noted that residential does not necessarily need to be included in “mixed use.”

The Executive Director cautioned against getting caught up in definitions. He said that we need to stay flexible and provide more choices than we have today.

Councilmember Emery expressed a concern about the CTAC recommendation if the intent is to use transit funds for roadway improvements. He also said that we need to be mindful that there are some areas that are considered to be “urban” due to their population size, in what we would historically call “rural” surroundings such as Ramona, Fallbrook, and Lakeside.

Mayor Mary Sessom (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) asked if the transit-related roadway improvements would include trolley grade separations. *Staff replied that the Smart Growth Incentive Program is on a funding scale that could not afford the amount needed for grade separations. The comment from CTAC related to the impacts to the roadway system from public transit and whether this funding source could help to mitigate this impact, such as funding left-turn pockets. The Executive Director said that this establishes the framework, and the next step is to develop detailed criteria.*

Councilmember Dale expressed a concern that the cities and areas have a reliable source of revenue to fund these impacts. He stated that we should continue to work with the state on funding for ongoing services. He thought that the state should provide funding for college dorms to reduce traffic congestion around educational institutions.

Mayor Kellejian noted that Palomar College and the California State University (Cal State) at San Marcos are both listed as activity centers, and there will be a Sprinter station at Cal State San Marcos.

Action: The Transportation Committee accepted this report.

3. METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS) ROUTE 11 BUS STOP CONSOLIDATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (APPROVE)--**CONTINUED**

Staff provided background information on this item.

Public Comment:

Theresa Quiroz, a member of the public, commented that Route 13 was 17-18 minutes late to her stop which meant that she missed two trolleys at the Euclid Station to be able to get into downtown San Diego in time for this meeting. She noted that speed is definitely an issue in public transit. She didn't think that

cutting five minutes from a route would make much difference especially if the passenger has to walk farther to catch the bus. She expressed concern about the stops on Route 965 that bypass significant activity centers. She suggested using express buses to improve service. She also suggested that planners consult with affected communities before service changes are implemented.

Supervisor Roberts asked how Ms. Quiroz came in this morning. She responded that she took Route 13 to the Euclid Trolley Station. The Route 13 bus arrived at her bus stop about 18 minutes late which meant that she missed several trolleys at the Euclid Trolley Station to come into downtown San Diego.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe stated that the report indicated there was significant community outreach and coordination with two San Diego Council Districts on this Route 11 bus stop consolidation project. Ms. Quiroz agreed that the public outreach efforts on this project were comprehensive, but this has not always been the case for every proposed service change.

Supervisor Roberts commented his surprise about a route that is going by significant activity centers without appropriate bus stops. He asked that Ms. Quiroz be notified of MTS Board meetings where this issue will be discussed. He thought that coordinating transit connections is more important than consolidating bus stops.

The Executive Director clarified that Ms. Quiroz's comments were in agreement that there was appropriate public involvement in this Route 11 bus stop consolidation project and she thought this process should continue for other proposed service changes. Ms. Quiroz agreed with this clarification.

Paul Jablonski, Executive Director of MTS, said that he will work on the issue related to Route 13. He agreed that customer involvement in any of these planning processes is very important, and this process sets the standard for any changes proposed to be made. He stated that issues relating to on-time performance have been identified in the system. The bus stop consolidation project is one way to improve operations.

Leon Williams asked about the status of a proposal that would allow buses throughout the state to pull out from bus stops and not be trapped behind cars for two or three light cycles. The SANDAG General Counsel stated that staff is pursuing legislation, included in SANDAG's legislative program, related to a bill for queue jumpers that would allow buses to leave an intersection before the general traffic.

## 7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meetings of the Transportation Committee are scheduled for Friday, May 21, 2004, and Friday, June 4, 2004.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:43 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
MAY 7, 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	Arrived for Item #4
	City of Santee	Hal Ryan	Alternate	No	
South County	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Member	Yes	
	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Alternate	Yes	Arrived for Item #4
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	Arrived for Item #6
	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Alternate	Yes	Arrived for Item #4
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Oceanside	Terry Johnson	Member	Yes	Arrived for Item #4
	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	Yes	