

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MARCH 4, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF FEBRUARY 18, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:04 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mary Sessom (San Diego Regional Airport Authority) and a second by Councilmember Jack Feller (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the February 4, 2005, meeting. Mayor Art Madrid (East County) abstained from voting on the minutes.

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

There were no public comments, communications, or member comments.

CONSENT ITEM (3)

3. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENT FOR CITY OF CHULA VISTA (APPROVE)**

The City of Chula Vista has requested an amendment to a TDA claim to use \$63,500 from its unallocated TDA reserve to establish an operator performance-based retention incentive program. The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board, at its January 27, 2005, meeting approved amending its TDA claim to reflect the request from the City of Chula Vista. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the claim amendment.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Judy Ritter (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item No. 3.

CHAIR'S REPORTS

4. VERBAL REPORT ON THE MTS COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (COA) BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Kellejian stated that this item was placed on the agenda as a placeholder, but the Blue Ribbon Committee has yet to hold its first meeting; that will occur on March 4. He represents SANDAG and the Transportation Committee on this Blue Ribbon Committee.

Public Comment:

Steve Alcove, President of the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), said that he had been reelected as the representative for San Diego Transit Corporation's (SDTC's) bus drivers' union. He thanked the Transportation Committee for allowing labor to be a participant on the Blue Ribbon Committee.

5. VERBAL REPORT ON THE MTS COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONS ANALYSIS (COA) TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)

Toni Bates, Division Director of Transit Planning, stated that the intent of this report is to inform the Committee that staff plans to provide a monthly COA status report. When the Blue Ribbon Committee does start meeting, Chair Kellejian will bring the Transportation Committee up-to-date on those meetings. SANDAG staff will be participating on the technical committee. This technical committee has started to identify efficiencies to provide some operating cost savings for the FY 2006 year. At the end of March, there will be some public open houses to review the recommended proposals that will have been previously reviewed by the Blue Ribbon Committee. She reviewed the public hearing dates.

Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, stated that it is exciting to see for the first time the various people involved on the technical side, both operations and planning, to brainstorm the system and come up with what we hope will be some very productive interim steps.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) expressed some confusion about the technical committee beginning its work before the Blue Ribbon Committee has met. *Ms. Bates replied that the work of the technical committee is to identify the easiest places to find efficiencies, and doing some field work and assessments. This will provide guidance for the Blue Ribbon Committee moving forward.*

Councilmember Monroe asked that Mr. Jablonski and Ms. Bates talk with him following the meeting to discuss this issue further.

Chair Kellejian noted that a previous Transportation Committee meeting item on this subject had contained a schedule of milestones. He asked that this information be distributed to the Committee. (Note: Agenda item No. 5 from the January 7, 2005, Transportation Committee meeting was distributed to the members later in the meeting.)

REPORTS

6. TRANSIT OPERATING REVENUE ESTIMATES AND ALLOCATIONS (RECOMMEND)

Sookyung Kim, Program Coordinator, reported that operators receive funds from various federal, state, and local revenues for ongoing operations and major capital projects. This report provides information on the apportionments for the upcoming fiscal year (2006) and the projection of revenues for FY 2007-2010 for each fund type. There are four major sources of funding for transit: Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA), federal formula funds (Section 5307 and Section 5309 the Fixed Guideway Modernization program), and *TransNet*. Ms. Kim explained each of these sources and amounts for the next fiscal year and for FY 2007-2010.

Councilmember Monroe asked about the legislative priorities. *Ms. Kim referred him to the first box on Table 1 in the agenda report.*

Ms. Kim reviewed the apportionment trends for TDA from FY 2001 through FY 2006.

Ms. Kim stated that in the original *TransNet* program, of the one-third transit share, up to 40 percent of the revenues could be used for operating and non-rail capital purposes. For FY 06, \$236 million in revenues is estimated for the entire program, and \$77.7 million is available for transit capital and operating purposes, which is a 4.5 percent increase from the estimated FY 2005 revenues.

The distribution for the *TransNet Extension* is slightly different from the original measure. Monies are taken off the top for administration, the Independent Transportation Oversight Committee (ITOC), and for bike/pedestrian uses, then the major transit corridors receive 42.4 percent, new bus rapid transit (BRT)/rail operations receive 8.1 percent, local system improvements receives 33 percent, and transit system improvements/operations receive 16.5 percent. Within the 16.5 percent for Transit System Improvements/Operations are costs associated with providing services to seniors and the disabled, which are deducted off the top. The remaining balance is for operations, miscellaneous capital, and regional transit priorities. Staff is recommending that the revenues be allocated for the current program as adopted by the SANDAG Board.

Ms. Kim described the two Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds: Section 5307 is the Urbanized Area program at \$49 million and Section 5309 is the Fixed Guideway program at \$12.5 million. There is an overall 2.4 percent revenue increase from the last fiscal year. We are still waiting for Congress to approve a reauthorization of the federal transportation bill.

Ms. Kim stated that as part of consolidation SANDAG now receives funds for the capital improvement program (CIP). The federal Section 5309 funds implement the CIP for MTS and NCTD.

Chair Kellejian referred members to Table 3 in the agenda report. He said that the total available for MTS projects and service is the current maximum of 40 percent for operations from *TransNet*. The *TransNet Extension* continues that percentage. The difference with an

amount of money over and above what MTS and NCTD are currently receiving which is placed into a regional discretionary pot.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, reiterated that in the existing *TransNet* Ordinance one-third goes to transit and up to 40 percent of that amount can be used for operations. In the new *TransNet* Ordinance beginning in 2008, the amount that will be available for operations is 16.5 percent. Staff has been working with the operators to determine regional criteria for the SANDAG Board to consider for these discretionary funds. About 13 percent continues what is in the existing program. The region as a whole would have additional funds to augment existing service or add new service.

Chair Kellejian asked who will decide where that discretionary money goes. *Mr. Gallegos replied that the details remain to be worked out. Currently, the transit funds come through the SANDAG Transportation Committee before it goes to the SANDAG Board.*

Ms. Kim added that all of the projects will go through Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and there is a certain amount of criteria involved for making those decisions.

Councilmember Feller mentioned that input from the Board's retreat was in support of high-quality service to entice choice riders. He said that we should pursue funding for this purpose.

Councilmember Monroe expressed concern about keeping funding at historical levels when we may have a completely different system after the COA recommendations have been implemented. We will need to balance operations, capital projects, and maintenance. *Mr. Gallegos said that the good news about the TransNet Extension is that it offers more flexibility than in the original measure.*

Mr. Jablonski clarified that the operators receive 13 percent from the existing TransNet Ordinance and that is split about 70/30 basis between MTS/NCTD. In the *TransNet Extension* that percentage increased from 13 percent to 16 percent.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, noted that staffs of the operating agencies are still discussing an appropriate mechanism to fund those functions that were transferred as part of consolidation.

Councilmember Ritter asked how those TransNet discretionary monies will be spent. *Mr. Gallegos replied that the SANDAG Board will make that decision; however, it will be in conjunction with the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Staff will be developing criteria to apply to this discretionary funding.*

Councilmember Feller commented that senior transportation could take up most of that pot of money.

Mr. Jablonski asked if the discretionary money could be used for capital. *Mr. Gallegos replied affirmatively. He said that there is more flexibility in the TransNet Extension than was in the original measure.*

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Feller and a second by Councilmember Ritter, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board adopt the FY 2006 allocations and approve the revenue projections for FY 2007 to FY 2010 at its February 25, 2005, meeting.

7. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) (APPROVE)

Kim York, Project Control Manager, reported that the CIP forms the basis for updating the RTP and the federal formula grant applications. She provided information about the funding sources for the transit CIP. This is a primary source of funding for operations and replacement purposes. The CIP includes NCTD and MTS capital projects, NCTD local and minor improvement projects, and operating assistance (preventive maintenance). The CIP is developed and approved by the operators. The total capital needs are \$715 million, and the unfunded capital projects total \$332 million. She said that we need to aggressively pursue other funds to meet these unfunded needs.

Ms. York said that the FY 2006 transit CIP challenges include operating assistance (for capital replacement needs) and multi-year project funding. The MTS capital project needs are three times the amount available. Staff is recommending a transfer of \$11 million from existing capital projects to the FY 2006 CIP. These existing projects are not canceled; the money is coming from projects that were completed under budget, or projects that were deferred for various reasons.

Ms. York reviewed the FY 2006 CIP schedule and the recommended action to approve the FY 06 CIP, the submittal of federal Section 5707 and 5309 applications for the San Diego region, transfer \$11 million from the indicated MTS projects to the FY 06 CIP, and an amendment of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Chair Kellejian clarified that CIP projects 1-34 are recommended for federal formula funds in FY 05, CIP projects 35-40, are recommended for dedicated funding, CIP projects 35-40 are safety and security projects that may be eligible for special funding, and CIP projects 41-56 are those submitted by engineering that were not on a priority list. He reiterated that there is no funding for projects 57 through 170.

Councilmember Feller asked if what we are approving is a draft. *Mr. Gallegos said that staff is seeking approval from this committee to send to the Board for final approval. Ms. York indicated that the FY 06 funding is set because those projects have been rated and prioritized. Projects in FY 2007-2010 can be reprioritized annually.*

Ms. King noted that for NCTD's process this is premature. The NCTD Board approved a preliminary CIP. In order to balance the operating budget they may have to defer a capital project, which would result in a change to this listing. There will be a final CIP when the NCTD Board adopts its budget in June.

Ms. York said that we are proposing projects for submittal of the federal grant applications in a timely manner. If NCTD approves something that is different than presented today, we will move with an amendment or change.

Mayor Madrid commented that there has been some significant gang activity in East County and he wondered about the acquisition of security cameras at East County trolley stations. He thought that we should pursue an aggressive program to use these video cameras as a tool to help security. *Mr. Jablonski replied that item No. 20 on the funded list includes installing video surveillance cameras at the Spring Street Trolley Station. This project will go forward immediately along with the implementation of cameras at stations in Chula Vista. MTS will share the costs of this project with NCTD on a 50/50 basis of unallocated TDA funds. Mr. Jablonski noted that the CIP projects that are to receive dedicated funding are unfunded projects. The category of dedicated funding is our program to go to Washington, D.C., to seek discretionary capital dollars through the federal Section 5309 program. We hope that at the federal level there will be some transit security bills associated with Homeland Security with money in them for transit security. We have a ready list of projects so when money becomes available, we will submit the entire program for funding.*

Mayor Madrid pointed out that every time we obtain money from the Homeland Security program we take away from the COPS program. He noted that we get back only 72 cents for every dollar we send to the federal government.

Mayor Sessom asked about the money being transferred from delayed projects. *Ms. York said the delayed project would most likely stay on the list and would compete for future funding. The project may have received bids over the amount of money allocated for the project, resulting in the project having to wait for additional funding before it can be implemented.*

Mr. Jablonski mentioned that there will be a correction related to the shifting of planning staff as part of consolidation.

Mr. Jablonski thanked SANDAG staff and, in particular, Kim York who participated with them in this program. It took three months of regular meetings to complete this effort.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board approve the CIP for the San Diego region and submit the associated grants and program amendments.

8. INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW (APPROVE)

Ms Bates said that SANDAG made a commitment as part of the *TransNet Extension* to conduct an independent transit planning review. The purpose of this review is to evaluate regional transit plans and projects in light of "best practices," and to assess plans for the ability to respond to identified travel markets. We would use a firm with international expertise in planning, design, construction, and operation of rail and bus rapid transit (BRT) systems. This will be a two-faceted study with a consultant study and a peer review panel.

Ms. Bates stated that the peer review panel will provide us with a qualified, capital, strong, and objective assessment of our projects. The criteria for the selection of peer review panel participants include real world experience with bus rapid transit, but guideway and/or light rail transit implementation and operations and should not have direct ties to projects and

plans in San Diego. Staff has initially proposed representatives from five areas: Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA); Ottawa OC Transpo; Pittsburgh PATH; Portland Tri-Met; Houston MTA; and possibly others.

Ms. Bates reviewed the preliminary work scope and tasks including: (1) assessing the effectiveness of the service hierarchy in achieving Regional Transit Vision goals, (2) reviewing the appropriateness of corridors based on travel demand and markets, (3) the ability of the network to serve our multi-centered region (4) the effectiveness of various transit modes and facilities, (5) a review of light rail transit (LRT) and BRT costs based on experience in other cities, and (6) related to insights into the effectiveness and potential for supportive land uses. Ms. Bates reviewed key dates for the peer review panel efforts. Final recommendations will be presented in December and will be incorporated into the update of the RTP.

Chair Kellejian noted that on page 2 of the agenda report are the names attached to those agencies listed.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) asked that in the future Committee members be provided with copies of the charts and graphs included with agenda reports.

Supervisor Roberts stated that we have now have some considerable experience with LRT and not with BRT. The reality is that BRT is not the answer for every situation. He asked if there is going to be some way that issues like that can be looked at in a real sense. He felt that BRT would make sense in certain areas and not in others. He expressed concern about bringing peer review people in that may not be familiar with the San Diego area. *Ms. Bates said that the Supervisor's concern about the applicability of BRT is why it is important to have peer review panelists with a variety of experiences. She added that dedicated transitways can be as expensive as LRT to build. Staff will highlight to the peer review panel members the constraints and get their reaction.*

Supervisor Roberts said he wanted an objective and balanced opinion from the peer review panel.

Ms. Bates mentioned that there are a lot of tradeoffs about where you build and operate BRT services. We want expert advice on those tradeoffs.

Mayor Madrid asked if staff had asked Mr. Jablonski and Ms. King their opinion on peer review panel candidates. *Ms. Bates replied that she did not ask them directly; however, this issue has been discussed at the staff level. She noted that not all of the people identified for the peer review panel have committed to this and they might have to be replaced with others.*

Mr. Jablonski said that he knew some of the peer review panel candidates. He stated that the thing about BRT is that there isn't a great number of these facilities already built in the United States. Ottawa and Pittsburgh have the most experience with them. For rail and LRT experience, he thought the best experience is here in San Diego, though Portland and St. Louis also have good systems.

Ms. Bates said that some of the cities have both LRT and BRT and we thought this would be a good representation because they made choices of which mode to use in various corridors.

Councilmember Feller wondered why we are looking at expertise from other areas when SANDAG is the model agency that everyone else looks to. He was concerned about spending money on this course of action when we are already on the cutting edge. *Mr. Gallegos responded that this was something that the Board agreed to as part of the TransNet Extension ordinance. It is healthy to get this independent review and help us validate that we are making good choices. He strongly urged the Committee to support this action. Ms. Bates said that the cost of the total effort is \$425,000 with the consultant and peer review expenditure at \$260,000 of that amount.*

Chair Kellejian noted that both the RTP and MOBILITY 2030 include BRT systems. There are some corridors that have technology options.

Supervisor Roberts asked if Transportation Committee members will have a chance to interact with the peer review panel members and have the opportunity to ask questions. *Mr. Bates said that after the first two- or three-day immersion in April the panel members would come back two or three more times in the course of the study. We could arrange a meeting with the Transportation Committee. Mr. Gallegos recommended a workshop with peer review panel and Transportation Committee members.*

Councilmember Monroe said that when we approved this as part of the *TransNet Extension* ordinance we should have changed the word "transit" to "transportation." He said that we should not focus on transit alone for an efficient system. He asked about the interaction between this effort and the COA. *Ms. Bates answered that the primary focus of this effort will be on the corridors that are candidates for major capital and operating investments. She acknowledged there might be some overlap with COA on arterial streets and staff will be cognizant of that.*

Councilmember Monroe expressed his disappointment that academia participation was dismissed in the peer review panel. He thought that there is a lot of information about new theories and new technologies. He questioned whether the people who have experience with existing system can help us plan for tomorrow.

Mayor Sessom agreed with Councilmember Monroe that we should have someone in a visioning type of role.

Supervisor Roberts said that there is no reason why peer review panel members cannot be visionaries because they have something on the ground. He wants to get something built. We should know that what we are doing is to extend the systems we have today for an effective result from our investment.

Mayor Madrid agreed with Monroe's comments. We need someone who can temper the real thing with what can be academic. He encouraged this for staff's recommendation.

Mr. Jablonski agreed it could be a challenge to maintain a level of objectivity in this effort. As we look at these things on a technical basis, there is another aspect, but these all

involved big dollar investments. Perhaps having someone with a background in economics might prove helpful.

Chair Kellejian suggested that we approve what is in front of us with regard to the peer review panel and direct staff to come back with recommendations related to academia or a futurist and an economist.

Ms. Bates said that the direction we are proposing is to look at the existing RTP and assess whether we have our investments targeted in the right corridors, and the infrastructure and ability to operate the services. Some of the criticism we have received were related to the method of station and priority treatments.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his appreciation for the consideration of additional peer review panel members.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Councilmember Ritter, the Transportation Committee approved the proposed study approach and preliminary scope of work for the Independent Transit Planning Review of the RTP and *TransNet* projects implementing strategy to help determine the most cost-effective and cost-efficient transit service and infrastructure plan for the region

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

Chair Kellejian noted that free Coaster tickets were distributed to Committee members. Ms. King said that they are two round-trip tickets celebrating the Coaster's tenth anniversary. On February 25 there will be a special recognition of riders. She encouraged Committee members to use the tickets. She added that beginning on Saturday, February 19 and on Saturdays through May 28, there is a two-for-one program in effect.

The next meetings of the Transportation Committee are scheduled for Friday, March 4 and March 18, 2005.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 18, 2005**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Alternate	Yes	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	No	
	City of San Marcos	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	No	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	Yes	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	No	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	No	
	----	Scott Peters	Alternate	No	
		Dick Murphy	Alternate	No	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	No	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	No	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	No	
North County Transit Development Board	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	No	Attended as North County Inland Rep.
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Member	Yes	
	Governor's Appointee	Xema Jacobson	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	