

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF MARCH 18, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:03 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 Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the March 4, 2005, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, suggested that implementing toll roads would provide funding to accelerate transportation projects. He suggested that SANDAG explore this possibility. Some key components to be considered are whether the toll road entity can issue tax exempt bonds, whether those tax revenues are subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT), and if the State will pay the maintenance and toll collection costs. There also should be a plan to end the tolls once the bonds are paid off.

Eric Pahlke, Chief Deputy Executive Director, stated that as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, we had planned on looking at alternative funding scenarios and conducting a detailed funding analysis, particularly given the report that came out recently by Bob Poole about building the high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and charging for using them. We will be reviewing that suggestion as well.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, solicited donations for the MS (Multiple Sclerosis) Team Water Walkers event on April 22, 2005. On the public transportation front, he referred to an article in today's *San Diego Union-Tribune* newspaper related to a problem with connections between older and newer light rail vehicles (LRVs). It was his opinion that this is a contractor engineering problem. Mr. Lungerhausen also expressed concern about our aging transportation system. He said that we have built a system with no program for updating it, and no good business functions on this type of arrangement. You cannot keep increasing transit fares for riders. He said that we need a 1 percent sales tax for transportation.

Chair Kellejian received permission from Mr. Lungerhausen to announce his address to receive MS donations.

A chart of the busiest stretches of highways with the most traffic across the nation was distributed. Chair Kellejian stated that Interstate 15 (I-15) was eighth on this list. He noted that after we complete the construction of I-15 improvements, we will have the capacity to exceed the busiest road in the nation (the I-405 in Los Angeles).

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, mentioned that last week they opened bids on the I-15 improvements, and the bids came in about 9 percent below the engineer's estimate. He added that they are working on the I-15 improvements in the vicinity of Miramar Way and Mira Mesa Boulevard and will open them up as soon as they are completed.

CHAIR'S REPORT

3. **VERBAL REPORT ON THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS) COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (COA) BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)**

Mayor Joe Kellejian stated that this committee had its first meeting on March 4, 2005, and instructions and background information were presented. Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, provided an overview of the MTS history and system. Staff and consultants provided an overview of the COA. The COA will include two phases: one will focus on achieving early and short-term operating efficiencies to make the buses and trolleys more responsive to customer needs, and the second phase will focus on restructuring the MTS network. This Blue Ribbon Committee will meet again on April 18. Chair Kellejian said that he will keep the Transportation Committee informed as this process moves forward.

4. **VERBAL REPORT ON THE MTS COA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)**

Dave Schumacher, Principal Planner, reported that the COA technical advisory committee met earlier this week and the information presented mirrored that of the Blue Ribbon Committee. The technical advisory committee consists of representatives from a number of agencies throughout the region, and will provide these agencies with the opportunity to provide input to the COA. The technical committee meeting schedule will parallel that of the Blue Ribbon Committee.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) expressed his disappointment with the progress of the Blue Ribbon Committee. This Committee was supposed to establish boundaries, set policy, and establish criteria that will be used throughout the COA, and that has not been accomplished. Yet, the technical committee started to look at routes that would be changed and have sent out initial correspondence to a number of jurisdictions about potential changes to various routes. Had a problem with the fact that he doesn't know what criteria are being used for those changes. He wants the Blue Ribbon Committee to be a part of the decision making on policy, boundaries, and criteria to ensure that the criteria will be visible and applied fairly.

REPORTS

5. 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - AMENDMENT NO. 6 - *TransNet* EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Sookyung Kim, Program Coordinator, reported that the 2004 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) includes all major transportation projects funded by federal, state, and local sources including the *TransNet* sales tax program. The current *TransNet* measure will expire in 2008, and in November 2004, San Diego County voters approved the *TransNet* extension for an additional 40 years. At its January 2005 meeting, the SANDAG Board approved the Early Action Program to jumpstart several projects identified in the *TransNet* extension. One of the first steps in implementing the early action projects is to include the proposed changes in the 2004 RTIP.

Amendment No. 6 includes projects identified under Tier 1 and 2 of the Early Action Program. Based on initial estimates, approximately \$274 million in additional funds are needed through FY 2008 for the Tier 1 and 2 projects either to continue them on their current schedule or on an accelerated pace. It is anticipated that additional early action projects for transit, the environmental mitigation program, and projects identified by local agencies as candidates for early action will be included in the next RTIP amendment. Staff is working with our regional partners to further refine the funding needs for these projects. An update to the *TransNet* Plan of Finance for both the current program as well as the extension is underway. A draft Plan of Finance would include all of the early action projects and is scheduled for Transportation Committee review in May, with a recommendation to the SANDAG Board in June. The next RTIP amendment reflecting all of the early action projects would be included with the final Plan of Finance. The Transportation Committee is requested to adopt Resolution No. 2005-19 approving 2004 RTIP Amendment No. 6.

Chair Kellejian commented that on page 2 of the agenda report it talks about the Interstate 805 (I-805) HOV/Managed Lanes going into the preliminary engineering phase from Telegraph Road north to I-5. He questioned why this wouldn't go down further south to Olympic Parkway seeing as how the bus rapid transit (BRT) system is going to come from the Otay Gate up State Route (SR) 125 and then down Olympic Parkway to I-805 and then north. It would seem to him that in that particular instance, the BRT should start in an HOV lane on I-805 at Olympic Parkway rather than at Telegraph Canyon Road, which is to the north. *Mr. Pahlke responded that it is his understanding that the original limit of Telegraph Canyon Road was set due to a fairly significant increase in the traffic volume projected from that point north. However, there also is analysis underway that would indicate that planned BRT service may be coming down Olympic Parkway. In consideration of this, staff is in discussions with Caltrans about whether the I-805 improvements should be extended further south so that they span the entire corridor from SR 905 to the I-5 merge. Originally, Caltrans and SANDAG staff thought we could do two segments, the south segment to SR 54, and the northernmost segment, with some concern that the middle segment going over Mission Valley could delay the project if done as one large project. Now we are working with Caltrans and the resource agencies to figure out a way to do three separate documents so the issues in Mission Valley won't delay work in other parts of the corridor. The challenge now is to see if we can add that to the south segment. He recommended that the*

Transportation Committee take action today to include that whole corridor, and staff will report back as to whether there are any issues related to that action. Mr. Orso-Delgado added that it would not be a problem to extend the BRT lane further south to Olympic Parkway or all the way to SR 905. We could start at Olympic Parkway and go north from there.

Chair Kellejian said there are major improvements at that interchange now. *Mr. Pahlke noted that in terms of the dollars that are shown in your document, we can modify those in May when we come back with the next RTIP amendment as part of the Plan of Finance update.*

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) said he would like to endorse that suggestion. He moved the staff recommendation to extend the project limit south to SR 905. Councilmember Jack Feller (North County Transit District [NCTD]) seconded the motion.

Discussion on Motion:

Councilmember Feller asked if the \$274 million discussed at the top of the second page of the agenda item will come from the *TransNet* extension rather than the current *TransNet* measure. Chair Kellejian replied that was correct.

Public Comment:

Jay Powell, representing the City Heights Community Development Corporation, requested that the Transportation Committee consider including the Mid-City transit plazas, in-line stations access, and the median BRT line to the Early Action Program. He said his organization has done a lot of work in the last several years in helping to revitalize and redevelop that community. Their major issue as a community is to get people to work and to job centers. Right now there are interim bus stops on the off-ramp islands that have express routes in the peak hours that are moving people to job centers to the north and south. This is critically important in terms of their economic development strategy. The City of San Diego is building improvements to the two transit plaza decks at El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue. The transit decks were deliberately designed to accommodate elevators down to the platforms where people could board in-line BRT services to the job centers. We hope to have a comprehensive system with this request, that would connect the community to the Trolley line in Mission Valley.

Chair Kellejian stated that this issue will be discussed when staff reports back with a discussion of the additional early action projects. *Mr. Pahlke added that the first time the Transportation Committee discussed the early action projects, there was a request that staff analyze if there are some additional early action transit projects. We have been reviewing that issue. One of those projects would include the BRT routes that will use the I-15 Managed Lanes along the north I-15 corridor and continue south to the segment of I-15 through Mid-City that Mr. Powell talked about, and then make a turn on SR 94 into downtown San Diego. We are putting together the cost estimates and some schedules for the additional work for those BRT lines that would come through the Mid-City area. We will be returning to this Committee with that information and the other early action transit projects in addition to those that are already included in your agenda package.*

Supervisor Roberts asked about the time frame. *Mr. Pahlke said that it will be no later than May, when we come back with the Plan of Finance. He is pushing staff to come back in April.*

Chair Kellejian asked staff to inform Mr. Powell when this matter comes back to the Transportation Committee.

Councilmember Madaffer (City of San Diego) asked that when staff reports back to add the information about the anticipated costs of the engineering for the elevators and the stations in the Mid-City area, and the timeline for completing the additional items. He also asked staff to evaluate if there would be costs or operational benefits to complete these in concert with the remainder of the I-15 corridor.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Rindone and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2005-19 approving Amendment No. 6 to the 2004 RTIP, including extending the I-805 preliminary engineering analysis down to SR 905 or at a minimum to Olympic Parkway.

6. INTERSTATES 805/5 (I-805/I-5) SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS (APPROVE)

Elisa Arias, Senior Planner, reported that SANDAG, in partnership with Caltrans, has been conducting a study of the entire I-805 corridor and I-5 south of SR 54. A technical working group has been meeting regularly to provide input to this study. Ms. Arias stated that staff is asking the Transportation Committee to approve the recommendations for improvements, and to direct staff to consider them in the next RTP update. Completion of this study will allow the start of the environmental phase of the projects, and the corridor study report will serve as Caltrans' project initiation document.

Ms. Arias stated that the purpose of the study is to identify multimodal transportation projects and services to improve the mobility of people and freight for corridor trips. The study objectives are to increase capacity to move people and goods, provide travel choices for regional trips that include transit and carpools, in addition to drive alone, and sustain current travel times for drive alone in 2030 taking into account projected growth in population, employment, and travel demand. Other study objectives include to sustain current travel times for goods movement related trips and to provide highway facilities and regional transit services that support transit and carpool travel times to major job centers that are competitive with driving alone. The last objective is to achieve a minimum 10 percent mode share for transit and 12 percent for carpools for work trips at peak periods in 2030 within the study area.

Ms. Arias said that eight multimodal alternatives that assumed different levels of regional transit service and highway improvements were evaluated to determine which ones better met the study's need and purpose. Of the eight alternatives, in May 2004, the Transportation Committee approved three "build" alternatives and the "No Build" alternative for additional study. Ms. Arias illustrated each of these alternatives. Alternative 1, No Build, is used as the basis for comparing the three Build alternatives and has to be evaluated in the upcoming environmental analysis. It includes no improvements

to I-805 and I-5 south (which currently have eight general purposes lanes each, four in each direction), and it includes only current and near-term transit services (Coaster and Blue Line Trolley including the Mission Valley East extension).

Alternative 3 is essentially the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) MOBILITY 2030 network for both transit and highway projects. This alternative includes four new Managed Lanes, two in each direction, throughout the I-805 corridor and two HOV lanes, one in each direction, for I-5 in the South Bay. The *TransNet* extension includes two HOV lanes on I-5 south, two HOV reversible lanes on I-805 south of SR 54, and four Managed Lanes on I-805 north of SR 54. The footprint of the Managed Lanes and HOV lanes are expected to fit mostly within the existing right-of-way, though some right-of-way takes might be necessary. In addition to improvements to the Coaster and Blue Line Trolley and new service in the Mid-Coast corridor, six bus rapid transit (BRT) routes are included. BRT service would link San Ysidro to Sorrento Valley, downtown San Diego to Otay Mesa, downtown San Diego to Fashion Valley and the University Towne Centre (UTC), H Street to Otay Ranch, 32nd Street to Clairemont Mesa, and El Cajon to UTC. Of those routes, two of the BRT routes are included in *TransNet*; they are the downtown San Diego to Otay Mesa and San Ysidro to Sorrento Valley routes. *TransNet* also includes funding for increasing Coaster service, Blue Line Trolley service, and the new Mid-Coast light rail transit (LRT) service to Balboa, UTC, and the University of California, San Diego (UCSD).

Alternative 5 represents enhanced levels of regional transit service beyond the LRT and BRT routes just mentioned. The highway improvements reflect MOBILITY 2030 and include four Managed Lanes on I-805 and two HOV lanes on I-5 south. Examples of additional BRT service are routes between Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa, Main Street to Eastlake via Otay Ranch, El Cajon to San Ysidro, BRT on University Avenue, and service between Point Loma, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Poway Parkway.

For Alternative 6, in addition to the four Managed Lanes in the entire I-805 corridor and the two HOV lanes on I-5 south, this alternative includes two mixed-flow lanes from Telegraph Canyon Road to the Mission Valley Bridge and from the Mission Valley Bridge to the I-5 merge. It proposes the 2030 MOBILITY level of regional transit, similar to Alternative 3.

Ms. Arias stated that staff evaluated the three Build alternatives using several performance measures for the study area. The evaluation of Alternatives 3, 5, and 6 pointed to strengths and weaknesses in their performance. Following this evaluation, Alternative 9 was developed by combining the most effective improvements included in those three scenarios. Using Alternative 3 as the foundation (which includes two HOV lanes on I-5 south, the four Managed Lanes on I-805, and the regional transit services included in MOBILITY 2030), the best performing BRT routes and direct access ramps from Alternative 5, and the best performing highway elements from Alternative 6 (which are HOV-to-HOV connectors and additional segments of mixed-flow lanes) were incorporated to create Alternative 9. There are two BRT routes, Route 616 from Point Loma to Mira Mesa and Scripps Poway Parkway, and BRT service on University Avenue, that are included in the unfunded RTP that staff is proposing to bring into Alternative 9. In addition, Alternative 9 includes two segments of general purpose lanes on I-805 from H Street to SR 15, and from SR 52 to La Jolla Village Drive, and two additional HOV-to-HOV connectors at I-805 at SR 94, and I-805 at I-15. In addition to implementing the MOBILITY 2030 plan for regional transit service and highway

improvements, Alternative 9 would advance other projects that were identified as unfunded needs in the 2030 RTP. This corridor study recommends that these additional projects and services be considered for inclusion in the next RTP update.

Ms. Arias reviewed the results of the evaluation of the four Build alternatives. Alternative 9 shows the best performance in travel time savings and ties with Alternative 6 in congestion relief. This alternative also shows good performance in attracting work trips to transit and carpools. Capital and operating cost estimates for the Build alternatives range from \$6.4 billion to \$9.1 billion, with Alternative 5 having the highest cost. A preliminary environmental constraint analysis was conducted and shows that Alternative 6 would have the highest environmental constraints for I-805. At this level of evaluation, however, staff cannot say whether those differences would result in impacts to the environmental clearance or permitting processes. The environmental constraints analysis was prepared before Alternative 9 was developed. However, in terms of its footprint, Alternative 9 would fall somewhere between Alternatives 3 and 6, and for the I-805 corridor, Alternative 9 is likely to share some of same the environmental constraints as Alternative 6.

The evaluation of performance clearly shows that the recommended Alternative 9 would meet the objectives outlined in the study's need and purpose. This alternative addresses mobility by increasing capacity to move people and goods and by providing travel choices for carpooling and transit in addition to drive alone. It supports reliability by yielding the highest travel time savings and provides congestion relief by substantially reducing congestion during peak hour. Alternative 9 surpasses the minimum goal of a 10 percent mode share for work trips at peak periods and comes within reach of the 12 percent carpool mode share.

Ms. Arias distributed a handout (Table 1 in the agenda report). The check marks on this table indicate those projects and services that are included in the *TransNet* extension. Alternative 9 proposes the addition of two general purpose lanes between H Street and SR 15 and between SR 52 to La Jolla Village Drive, which are not part of MOBILITY 2030.

Ms. Arias stated that in addition to this ultimate improvement strategy, an interim strategy is recommended for the segment of I-805 between SR 54 and SR 905 for consistency with the current SR 125 toll road franchise agreement. The franchise agreement allows Caltrans to make those capacity improvements identified in the 2020 RTP, which included two HOV lanes. Capacity improvements beyond the two HOV lanes may result in compensation to the developer, California Transportation Ventures (CTV), for potential revenue losses that would be estimated by an independent traffic analysis. There have been some discussions with CTV for potential changes to the agreement, and Senator Denise Ducheny recently introduced legislation that proposes to extend the period of the franchise agreement from 35 to 45 years. The interim strategy would develop the ultimate footprint for the I-805 corridor, and the interim configuration for I-805 between SR 54 and SR 905 would be two new HOV lanes, one in each direction; two new transit lanes, one in each direction; and two auxiliary lanes between SR 54 and Telegraph Canyon Road, as needed. The interim improvement strategy also would build the direct access ramps that were identified for carpools and BRT service.

Ms. Arias said that approval of the study recommendations and completion of the corridor study would allow Caltrans and SANDAG to start the environmental and preliminary engineering phase for the HOV and Managed Lanes projects. Earlier in the meeting, the Committee approved \$26 million for this effort as part of report on the amendment to 2004 RTIP. Staff recommends that the Transportation Committee approve Alternative 9 as the ultimate strategy for improvements on the I-805 and I-5 south corridors, approve an interim strategy for improvements on I-805 south of SR 54, and direct staff to consider the study recommendations in the preparation of the next 2030 RTP update.

Councilmember Feller asked about the main difference between Alternatives 6 and 9. *Ms. Arias replied that Alternative 6 proposes the two additional general purpose lanes all the way from Telegraph Canyon Road to the merge. Another difference is that Alternative 9 includes two additional BRT routes, and additional direct access ramps.*

Councilmember Feller asked if having the different lane configurations would bottleneck traffic. *Ms. Arias responded that the traffic volumes indicate that the configuration would work, and the lanes would be tapered in order to avoid the bottlenecks. Mr. Orso-Delgado added that there is expected to be huge increases in traffic volumes over the next 20 to 30 years, and these proposed lane configurations will effectively serve those increased volumes.*

Councilmember Rindone asked whether there would be any problems with right-of-way and the need for exercising powers of eminent domain. *Ms. Arias replied that there may be a need for some right-of-way acquisitions. Once the environmental phase of the project is initiated, there will be more information on the exact right-of-way needs.*

Councilmember Rindone said that the expansion of improvements in the I-805 corridor may theoretically decrease the volume for SR 125 and result in a cost impact to CTV. *Mr. Orso-Delgado added that when Caltrans signed the franchise agreement with CTV there was a non-compete clause. Part of that agreement stipulated that we would look at the 2020 RTP, and anything we would do above and beyond the planned improvements in that RTP would trigger a requirement to conduct a traffic study to evaluate if CTV would be adversely impacted.* Councilmember Rindone asked for more information on the cost of that impact.

Councilmember Rindone expressed a concern about Route 627 not being included, as it is a high priority for the South Bay. *Ms. Arias stated that this route is included in Alternative 9 and is part of the current RTP and is proposed to remain in Alternative 9 as a recommended transit route.*

Councilmember Madaffer asked about the timing on the interim plan. *Ms. Arias responded that the franchise agreement has a term of 35 years from the time the toll road opens to traffic, which is expected in late 2006. The plan being recommended is through 2030. At some point there may be a decision made by the region to go beyond the interim strategy. Mr. Pahlke added that in terms of the interim strategy, we would hope that ongoing discussions with CTV and Caltrans would avoid that interim action. In terms of the timing of many of the improvements, those that are in TransNet are funded. There are other sources of funds for other projects. Until we get into developing the next RTP update, we cannot define the timing of all of the improvements.*

Councilmember Madaffer expressed support for Alternative 9.

Councilmember Madaffer asked about the differences in the costs between Alternative 5 and Alternative 9. *Mr. Pahlke said that the total if you combined the various improvements from Alternatives 5 and 9 would be about \$9.5 billion for I-805 and I-5 south.*

Councilmember Madaffer said that we may have some routes in Alternative 5 that we really ought to monitor. *Ms. Arias stated that the two BRT routes from Alternative 5 that we are proposing to add to Alternative 9 are the two best performing routes in Alternative 5.*

Councilmember Monroe asked if the extension of the SR 125 franchise agreement is good for SANDAG. *Mr. Pahlke said that it is his understanding that Senator Ducheny will not proceed with the bill to extend the franchise without SANDAG support. We have had some preliminary discussions with CTV, the City of Chula Vista, and the County of San Diego. We anticipate concluding those discussions and reporting back to the Executive Committee as soon as we are able to so that we can take some official position on the bill.*

Councilmember Monroe asked if the Managed Lanes are for HOV and FasTrak users or for general purpose users. *Ms. Arias replied that they are for HOV, BRT services, vanpools, and carpools, and solo drivers would be allowed to use the lanes by paying a fee.*

Councilmember Monroe stated that we need to identify our priority. He didn't think our priority was congestion relief; it is to provide choice. That drives us in two totally different directions. There are only two small segments of general purpose lanes for the people that aren't going to be in a carpool, participate in FasTrak, or ride transit. He thought that we "sold" the *TransNet* extension to relieve congestion. *Ms. Arias said that Alternative 9 both would achieve congestion relief and provides choice.*

Councilmember Emery stated that you can only build so many lanes of concrete.

Councilmember Emery asked if those projects included in Alternative 9 that don't have a checkmark are in the current RTP but not funded under the *TransNet Extension*. *Ms. Arias replied affirmatively, and added that they are part of the \$42 billion plan, the MOBILITY 2030 Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. The projects shown in blue type in Table 1 are not included in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.*

Mr. Emery asked about the BRT route from Point Loma to Scripps Poway Parkway. *Ms. Arias said it was identified in the unfunded part of the RTP, and we are proposing to include it in Alternative 9.*

Mr. Emery asked what effects the COA would have on this process. He said that as the operating entities go through the COA process, and they may find very unproductive existing routes. *Ms. Arias said that there will be collaboration with the transit operators on their implementation. Mr. Pahlke responded that in terms of the RTP update, we are focusing on the formal adoption in 2006 or 2007; we will reflect in the RTP analysis the results of the COA. The Transportation Committee and the two transit districts will be very involved in the update of the RTP.*

Councilmember Rindone said he will be voting on the CTV franchise agreement as part of the Chula Vista City Council. He asked General Counsel if there would be a conflict for him to vote on this issue here at SANDAG. *Jack Limber, General Counsel, responded that it was his belief that there is no conflict on the City taking a position on legislation and SANDAG taking a different position if we got into that situation. He didn't think the vote on sending this plan forward for the additional work is in conflict with any position the City might take on that legislation.*

Councilmember Rindone asked about funding for Route 627. *Chair Kellejian said that the funding for that project would come from additional funding sources in the RTP.*

Councilmember Jerome Stocks (Encinitas) asked for clarification on Alternative 6 related to the general purpose lanes. Ms. Arias replied that there are two general purpose lane segments on I-805 included in Alternative 9, while Alternative 6 includes continuous general purpose lanes on I-805 from Telegraph Canyon Road to the north.

Councilmember Stocks said that he was not in support of reducing general purpose lanes. From his perspective, Alternative 6 is superior in that regard and we should give it great consideration before removing general purpose lanes from our future plans. *Ms. Arias said that the 2030 RTP includes four managed lanes and no additional general purpose lanes. Alternative 9 would add two additional segments of general purpose lanes.*

Chair Kellejian said the theory is that the further way from employment centers the less people there are on that corridor. *Ms. Arias agreed with that statement and added that there may be additional routes that divert traffic off of the corridor. Mr. Pahlke clarified that in terms of the eight freeway lanes there today, 10-12 percent of the vehicles are carpools during the peak period. If you add the HOV or Managed Lanes, about 80 percent of the existing carpools will move into the carpool lanes, freeing up capacity in the general purpose lanes.*

Chair Kellejian added that you couple that with the new BRT services in those corridors, which will take more automobiles off the general purpose lanes. He asked what that percentage would be. *Ms. Arias said the current transit usage within the study area is about 7 percent in the morning and afternoon peak periods. With implementation of Alternative 9, it would reach 11.4 percent, which is higher than the 2030 RTP goal of achieving a 10 percent transit mode share.*

Chair Kellejian asked if it is possible to calculate how many cars are taken off of the general purpose lanes for each percentage point. *Ms. Arias said it was possible to calculate that but she did not have that information available at this meeting.*

Supervisor Roberts agreed with Councilmember Monroe's point. He asked if we have the ability to use some portion of the Managed Lanes for general purpose lanes if the plan doesn't work as envisioned. *Ms. Arias said that we can sell off excess capacity to single-occupant vehicles. Mr. Pahlke added that it depends on the funding source. If we use federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) dollars, then we would have a difficult time converting the HOV lanes into general purpose lanes at a later date. If you use State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or federal Regional Surface Transportation*

Program (RSTP) or local TransNet dollars, and at some future point you determine that the HOV lanes don't work, you could turn them into general purpose lanes. Mr. Orso-Delgado added that if we have them as HOV lanes or value pricing lanes, and try to convert them to general purpose lanes, we would have to go through an environmental document process prior to the conversion.

Supervisor Roberts stated that if we were to ensure the maximum flexibility we should implement the Managed Lanes without using the types of funds that would restrict the flexibility. *Mr. Orso-Delgado said that this might limit the ability to finance all of these projects.*

Supervisor Roberts said we need to look at that as a policy question. He expressed concern about the general public not having access to these various types of lanes. He supported a greater level of flexibility in the long-term.

Chair Kellejian stated that the theory is that if we can get more people to use transit, then there would be more capacity for those who cannot use transit.

Supervisor Roberts said he wanted to build in maximum flexibility that would allow us a future choice to convert Managed Lanes to general purpose lanes.

Councilmember Monroe asked Ms. Arias to review the transit usage. *Ms. Arias said it was 7.2 percent for transit in 2000 within the study area, and it would reach 11.4 percent in 2030.*

Councilmember Monroe stated that automobile traffic increases 2 percent to 3 percent per year. He asked what percentage increase we expected to have in automobiles on the highway in those years. *Ms. Arias agreed with the 2 to 3 percent increase and stated that traffic volumes are projected to increase between 40 to 60 percent over the 30-year period in some freeway segments.*

Councilmember Monroe said that he didn't think that the public campaign for the *TransNet* extension told the voters that the only thing we are going to provide for the person driving alone are two small portions of additional general purpose lanes. He suggested that we further discuss on this subject. *Mr. Pahlke said that in terms of what the voters were promised, they were told that Proposition A would implement BRT and Managed Lanes on I-805. The survey work that we did indicated that 75 percent of the people were in favor of both of those concepts. Chair Kellejian added that the maps disseminated to the public included maps of those projects in every area.*

Mr. Jablonski asked if staff had considered the flexibility of ultimately converting the HOV/Managed Lanes to rail. *Ms. Arias she is not sure that rail could accommodate the grades in I-805. Mr. Pahlke said that we can look at that as part of the 2030 RTP update. Right now the ridership numbers don't support it.*

Ms. Arias stated that Alternative 9 allows for more choice and has the same level of congestion relief contained in Alternative 6.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, said for the total number of congested lane miles, Alternative 6 and 9 perform the same, yet under Alternative 9 you are getting better choices of mobility other than the use of single-purpose lanes.

Mr. Orso-Delgado added that we also are looking at operational improvements to allow the traffic to flow easier than today. Alternative 9 adds more capacity in transit elements.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the reality is you can't have it all. What people want is congestion relief. We need to do what we can to improve our public transit system to have more choices. It is about congestion relief and congestion management. If the Managed Lanes concept doesn't work, then we should open them up to general purpose lanes. We have to make the facilities the best as possible. With the limited resources that we have in this region, this makes the most sense.

Supervisor Roberts said that he is not in disagreement with the vision; he just wants flexibility. In every step in the road to the extent that we make decisions that reduce flexibility, we need to understand the implications.

Councilmember Rindone rescinded his motion because he felt that approval of a plan that did not include the general purpose lanes on I-805 all the way to Telegraph Canyon Road would not reflect the South Bay's support of the *TransNet* extension.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved Alternative 9 as the ultimate strategy for improvements on the I-805 and I-5 south corridors, approved an interim strategy for improvements on I-805 south of SR 54, and directed staff to consider the study recommendations in the preparation of the next 2030 RTP update. Councilmember Rindone voted against the motion.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, April 1, 2005, and Friday, April 15, 2005. The April 1 meeting will be a joint meeting with the Regional Planning Committee.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:51 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 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	Yes	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	No	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	Yes	
	----	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	Yes	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit Development Board	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate		Attended as North County Inland representative
	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	No	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	