

Members

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

Jim Madaffer, Vice Chair
Councilmember, City of San Diego

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

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

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

Ron Roberts
Supervisor, County of San Diego

Bob Emery
Metropolitan Transit System

Jack Feller
Chair, North San Diego County
Transit Development Board

Mary Teresa Sessom
San Diego County Regional
Airport Authority

Alternates

Jerome Stocks
Councilmember, Encinitas
(Representing **North County Coastal**)

Scott Peters
Councilmember, City of San Diego

Dick Murphy
Mayor, City of San Diego

Judy Ritter
Councilmember, Vista
(Representing **North County Inland**)

Art Madrid
Mayor, La Mesa
(Representing **East County**)

Phil Monroe
Councilmember, Coronado
(Representing **South County**)

Pam Slater-Price
Chairwoman, County of San Diego

Dianne Jacob
Supervisor, County of San Diego

Leon Williams
Chairman, Metropolitan
Transit System

Judy Ritter
North San Diego County
Transit Development Board

Ed Gallo
North San Diego County
Transit Development Board

Xema Jacobsen
San Diego County Regional
Airport Authority

Advisory Members

Pedro Orso-Delgado
District 11 Director, Caltrans

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director, SANDAG



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, April 1, 2005

9 a.m. to noon

SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

**A PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD
JOINTLY WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SCHEDULE AND WORK PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE
- PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
- SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH
- BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW

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**

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, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.



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 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 noon, 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 for route information.



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Friday, April 1, 2005

ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION
---------------	-----------------------

+ 1.	APPROVAL OF MARCH 18, 2005 MEETING MINUTES	APPROVE
------	--	---------

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 and shall reserve time by completing a "Request to Speak" form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 4)

+ 3.	INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW (Dave Schumacher)	APPROVE
------	---	---------

On February 18, 2005, the Transportation Panel endorsed the proposal for conducting the Independent Transit Planning Review, including a two-faceted approach consisting of a technical consultant study with oversight by an independent Peer Review Panel. At the Transportation Committee's direction, the composition of the Peer Review Panel has been expanded to include an academic researcher in transportation with transit economics expertise in addition to transit agency professionals with direct bus rapid transit and light rail transit implementation and operational experience. The final make-up of the Peer Review Panel is provided in this report.

+ 4.	HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER RETROFIT PROGRAM (Richard Chavez)	APPROVE
------	---	---------

In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors programmed \$1,982,000 toward the construction of three noise barriers, two in the City of Oceanside adjacent to Interstate 5 (I-5), and one in the City of La Mesa adjacent to State Route 94 (SR 94). The costs of the noise barriers have increased since 2002 due to increases in construction and right-of-way costs. Staff and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) are presenting a recommendation for Transportation Committee approval in order to advance the development of the noise barrier program.

****9:30 A.M. - CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE****

PUBLIC COMMENTS (A)

A.	PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS	INFORMATION
----	--	-------------

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee and/or the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a "Request to Speak" form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CONSENT ITEM (B)

- + B. **STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (Hon. Jack Dale, SWG Chair; Carolina Gregor, Staff)** INFORMATION

The new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) has held their first two meetings. This item provides a status report on the group's work to date, including the upcoming election of two vice chairs, who will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

REPORTS (C-F)

- + C. **WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE (Michael Hix)** ACCEPT

This report provides an overview of the work program and schedule for updating the RTP. A technical RTP update is expected in 2006 to meet the requirements of the normal three-year update cycle. A more comprehensive RTP update is anticipated in 2007; this 2007 update, which will be based on an updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review and the strategic initiatives from the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to accept the proposed work program and schedule.

- + D. **PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance)** COMMENT

Project selection criteria and program guidelines for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program are presented for comment by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. This program has been spearheaded by an ad hoc working group that includes local agency planning and public work staff members, and Councilmember Phil Monroe from the Transportation Committee. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group, City/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and the Stakeholders Working Group have all provided input on the program.

- E. **SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH (Greg Shannon, Representative for Shedonna / NCTD Solana Beach Mixed Use Project)** INFORMATION

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees have received periodic presentations featuring local smart growth efforts throughout the region. A presentation will be made on the mixed use project currently proposed at the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD) COASTER station in Solana Beach.

+ F. BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW (Bill Lieberman)

INFORMATION

The definition and application of bus rapid transit is unique to each city and situation. Mr. Bill Lieberman, Transportation Planning and Operations Consultant, will present his research on bus rapid transit systems around the world and provide conclusions on his assessment of their characteristics and applicability to the San Diego experience and environment.

****ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE****

5. UPCOMING MEETINGS

INFORMATION

The next two Transportation Committee meetings are scheduled for Friday, April 15, 2005, and Friday, May 6, 2005.

6. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

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	

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3**

Action Requested: APPROVE

INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW

Introduction

The *TransNet* extension includes funding for a number of light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT) projects that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). At the SANDAG Board's direction, passage of the *TransNet* extension triggered a commitment to conduct an Independent Transit Planning Review of the RTP and regional transit projects to help determine the most effective and cost efficient transit service and infrastructure plan for the region.

On February 18, the Transportation Committee approved an action plan for the Independent Transit Planning Review. This Review includes hiring a consultant and the formation of a Peer Review Panel of individuals from outside the San Diego region to bring expert guidance and oversight from transit industry professionals with direct implementation and operating experience. The Transportation Committee approved the staff's recommended composition of the panel, with the addition of a member with an academic and/or economics background. The Transportation Committee directed staff to report back to it on the progress in lining up the panel participants.

In response to the Committee's direction, staff has contacted Dr. Robert Cervero, Professor of City and Regional Planning from University of California, Berkeley, who has agreed to participate on the Peer Review Panel as the academic expert. Dr. Cervero is well-known for his work in both transit planning and the economics of transit.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the composition of the Peer Review Panel, and authorize the staff to make future adjustments as needed to replace any members who may become unable to serve.

Discussion

Based on the Transportation Committee's direction, input from the American Public Transit Association, and colleagues in the field, we have invited and received confirmation from the following panelists:

- David Mieger, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority - Mr. Mieger is the Director of Westside Planning and has led the development of both light rail and bus rapid transit projects for the agency.

- John Bonsall, McCormick/Rankin – Mr. Bonsall is the former head of OC Transpo, the transit authority in Ottawa, Ontario, where he led development of its bus transitway system. Currently he serves as President of McCormick/Rankin, a consultant firm that has been involved in the development of a number of BRT projects throughout the world.
- Richard Feder, Pittsburgh Port Authority of Allegheny County – Mr. Feder serves as Director of Transit Planning and is involved in the planning, implementation, and operations of the agency's extensive LRT, BRT, and exclusive busway system.
- Phil Selinger, Portland Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon – Mr. Selinger serves as Director of Project Implementation for the agency's extensive LRT and bus system.
- Linda Cherrington, Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) – Ms. Cherrington serves as Program Manager for TTI's Transit Mobility Program, which has been involved in several studies involving high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities, BRT, and value pricing; she previously served as Assistant General Manager for the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority and Chief Executive Officer for LKC Consulting Services in Houston.
- Robert Cervero, University of California Berkeley – Dr. Cervero is professor of City and Regional Planning and is considered a leading expert in transit-oriented development, the land use and economic benefits of transit service, and transit/land use integration.

We have received an initial confirmation from each of these panelists, and are now making final arrangements for the first peer review panel meeting scheduled for April 20-22, 2005.

Next Steps

In the first peer review panel meeting, we will brief the panelists on the Regional Transit Vision and 2030 Mobility Plan network, discuss the issue areas identified in the February 18, 2005, Transportation Committee agenda item, and provide a tour of key RTP transit corridors. Based on this information, the panelists will help finalize the consultant work scope for the technical component of the project and review consultant proposals. We also have begun the process of soliciting responses to a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) from consultant firms with international expertise in BRT and LRT planning and design.

We plan to update the Transportation Committee on the results of the first peer review panel at the May 6, 2005 Transportation Committee meeting.

BOB LEITER

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Toni Bates, (619) 699.6950; tba@sandag.org

Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906; dsc@sandag.org

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **4**

Action Requested: APPROVE

HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER RETROFIT PROGRAM

Introduction

Noise levels exceed state and federal criteria at numerous residential locations adjacent to existing highways in the San Diego region. Passage of Senate Bill 45 (Kopp) in 1997 delegated the responsibility of addressing existing highway noise impacts on residential areas from the state to the regions. In 1998, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a policy for addressing existing highway noise issues and later amended this policy in 2001 (see Attachment 1). In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors programmed \$1,982,000 toward the construction of three noise barriers, two in the City of Oceanside adjacent to Interstate 5 (I-5) at an estimated cost of \$1,275,000, and one in the City of La Mesa adjacent to State Route (SR) 94 with an estimated cost of \$738,000.

In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors also approved a Use-It-or-Lose-It policy requiring the award of a construction contract for the three noise barriers within two years of the programming of the funding. Due to state transportation budget shortfalls, these funds were not programmed until November 2002. Also due to the state transportation budget shortfall, Caltrans has been unable to provide the staff resources needed to advance the projects. The Cities of Oceanside and La Mesa elected to wait until Caltrans was able to work on the projects instead of seeking consultant assistance.

The cost to construct the noise barriers has increased. The cost increases exceed the available programmed funds, and additional funds would be required to complete these noise barrier projects. The extension of the *TransNet* sales tax program is a possible source of funding for the Oceanside noise barriers. These noise barriers are being assessed as part of the I-5 North Coast project. The I-5 project was designated part of the *TransNet* Early Action Program by the SANDAG Board of Directors in January 2005.

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) discussed these issues at their March 3, 2005, meeting.

Recommendation

CTAC recommends that the Transportation Committee: (1) waive the Use-it-or-Lose-it policy for the three noise barriers due to staff resource impacts caused by the state transportation budget shortfall; (2) reallocate \$1,481,000 of the original \$1,982,000 to fully fund the La Mesa noise barrier project; (3) hold the remaining \$501,000 from the original \$1,982,000 in reserve for future noise barrier project funding cycles; and (4) program \$1,977,000 from the I-5 North Coast *TransNet* Early Action Program budget to fully fund the two Oceanside noise barrier projects.

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

1. **Fund Allocation:** SANDAG will allocate up to one percent (1%) of the funds available through the State Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Improvement Program (STIP-RIP) each cycle to fund eligible retrofit noise barriers. Each STIP-RIP cycle, the local jurisdictions are required to submit a request for their candidate retrofit noise barriers to SANDAG for funding consideration. The request must document that at least two-thirds of the residences immediately adjacent to the freeway desire installation of the noise barrier. The local jurisdictions are required to provide all engineering and right-of-way services, including construction contract administration, unless arrangements are made with Caltrans. The local jurisdictions are required to address long-term noise barrier maintenance issues to the satisfaction of Caltrans prior to funding allocation by SANDAG.

Funds will be allocated to the noise barrier(s) with the highest Priority Index number as determined by the Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Caltrans will maintain a two tier Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List. Funds will only be allocated to Tier one noise barriers.

STIP-RIP funds are programmed by SANDAG and administered by Caltrans. STIP-RIP funds are transferred by Caltrans to the local jurisdiction on a reimbursement basis. Strict use-it-or-lose-it rules apply to STIP-RIP funds, as defined in the STIP Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

2. **Eligibility:** Qualifying conditions are limited to residential areas with outdoor areas of frequent use immediately adjacent to existing interstate freeways or state highways where noise levels exceed 67 decibels (measured as the energy-average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a one hour period, dBA, Leq(h)). A retrofit noise barrier must meet minimum state and federal standards to be added to the Caltrans maintained Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

Barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List must be cost effective. The cost effectiveness criterion is established as \$45,000 per benefited living unit for the 2002 STIP-RIP funding cycle. This criterion will be adjusted for future STIP-RIP cycles by using the California Construction Cost Index as a guide. The noise barrier's cost effectiveness calculation should include all living units (i.e., houses, apartments, and condominiums) that will benefit by a reduction of 5 dBA or more as a result of the noise barrier construction. The noise barrier cost used in making the cost-effectiveness calculation should be the same as that used for calculating the Priority Index.

Noise barriers identified as part of an environmental document for noise abatement purposes for highway improvement or residential development projects will not be eligible for STIP-RIP funding as a retrofit noise barrier. All new highway projects will include noise barriers in accordance with state and federal policy. All new residential developments adjacent to highways will include noise barriers in accordance with state and local policy.

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

3. **Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List:** Caltrans will develop and maintain a comprehensive list of noise barrier needs in the region. Caltrans will perform field noise measurements as needed. Caltrans will maintain a two-tiered list: Tier one will consist of proposed noise barriers that have a completed Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Tier two will consist of proposed noise barriers that have no NBSSR. Noise barriers in Tier one will be listed in order, based upon their Priority Index numbers. Noise barriers in Tier two will be listed in order, based upon measured noise levels.
4. **Noise Barrier Scope and Summary Report (NBSSR):** The local jurisdictions are responsible for funding and completing the NBSSR. Caltrans is responsible for reviewing and approving the NBSSR. The noise barrier will be advanced from Tier two to Tier one once the NBSSR is approved by Caltrans. Proposed noise barriers must not conflict with projects currently programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Long-term maintenance strategies must be included in the NBSSR. NBSSR guidelines can be found in the Caltrans Design Program Web site at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd. The guidelines are in the Appendix F of the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) that is listed under the Manuals/Guidance/Design Topics heading on the Web site.
5. **Noise Barrier Requests:** Caltrans will investigate all noise barrier requests and maintain a log. The log will be shared with the local jurisdictions and SANDAG on a quarterly basis. The local jurisdictions are responsible to update their contact person information with Caltrans. Caltrans will develop and maintain an educational pamphlet about noise barriers for distribution purposes. If a requested noise barrier does not meet the minimum standards, Caltrans will send the educational pamphlet to the requester.
6. **Priority Index (PI) Calculation:** The PI is used for ranking Tier one noise barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

$$PI = (NL-67)^2 * AR * LU / \text{Cost (in \$1,000)}$$

NL: Is the average of the field-measured noise levels, dBA, Leq(h).

AR: Is the average reduction in noise levels that the proposed noise barrier will achieve. The NAC of 67dBA, Leq(h), is a goal for achievement, but is not mandatory. However, any noise barrier considered under this program must provide a minimum of 5 dBA noise reduction.

LU: Is the number of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway (i.e., first-line receivers). Residences located above the first floor in multistory units are included in the living unit count only if the proposed barrier will provide a 5dBA reduction for these units.

Cost: The noise barrier cost in \$1,000's includes all costs directly related to the proposed noise barriers. This includes items for engineering, right-of-way, earthwork, drainage, traffic control, structure work, planting, and other specialty work, as well as the noise barrier itself.

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

For projects that include noise barriers at multiple locations, the overall project's PI is calculated independently for each location. The PI for the combined project is calculated using a weighted average method, with the weighting based on the number of living units at each location.

7. **Priority Index (PI) Adjustment:** A major factor for determining priority is the percentage of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway where occupants have resided there since the time the highway opened. The local jurisdiction in which the residential area is located is responsible for providing documentation on percentage of living units with original occupants still residing immediately adjacent to the highway.

PI calculated by the above formula is enhanced by an amount equal to the actual percentage of living units with occupants currently still residing there. For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.00 and the documentation furnished by the local agency indicates that the current qualifying living unit percentage is 52.5 percent, then the priority index is adjusted to 62.5.

If the current occupant or occupants are the owners, then the date of purchase is used as documentation. For rental and leased properties, a statement is obtained from the landlord of the date occupancy commenced.

Another factor for determining priority is the level of contribution from the local jurisdiction. The PI is enhanced by half the percentage of local jurisdiction contribution towards the noise barrier cost up to a maximum of 33 percent (i.e., a maximum of 16.5 points). For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.0 and the local jurisdiction contributes 30 percent of the cost, then the priority index is adjusted to 25.0. A noise barrier may qualify for both an enhancement for residents that predate the highway and for a local jurisdiction contribution.

The cost used for determining the level of contribution is the same as for determining the PI, minus the cost of the NBSSR. No PI adjustment is given for local jurisdiction costs associated with completion of the NBSSR, as this is a basic program requirement. Resolution of the city council or Board of Supervisors demonstrates a contribution.

8. **Eligible Expenditures:** Only project features directly attributable to a retrofit noise barrier incurred after the noise barrier has been programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) are eligible for funding. Acceptable project features include drainage modification, earthwork, safety treatments, miscellaneous asphalt paving, landscaping, traffic control and right-of-way acquisition that is directly related to and needed for proper installation of the noise barrier. Support costs (development of final engineering plans, environmental clearance, right-of-way appraisal, construction management) are eligible for funding. Inappropriate project features include maintenance, upgrades, or enhancements to the adjacent residence or roadway, roadway slopes, or roadway features.

Noise Barrier Project Proposals

City	Route	From	To	Noise Level	Average Reduction	Living Units	Total Cost (thousands)	Cumulative Cost (thousands)	PI	Percent Residents Predate Freeway	Percent Local Contribution	Adjusted PI	
1	Oceanside	I-5	Whaley St	California St	72	10	17	\$558	\$558	8	29%	0%	37
2	La Mesa	SR-94	Waite Dr	Massachusetts Ave	77	12	12	\$738	\$1,296	20	0%	0%	20
3	Oceanside	I-5	Hillside Ln	California St	74	5	16	\$717	\$2,013	5	13%	0%	18
4	National City	I-805	Plaza Blvd	4th Street	74	7	37	\$886	\$2,899	14	0%	0%	14
5	El Cajon	I-8	SR-67	Mollison Ave	73	8	42	\$1,709	\$4,608	7	2%	0%	9
6	La Mesa	SR-94	69th St	King St	74	7	8	\$305	\$4,913	9	0%	0%	9
7	La Mesa	SR-94	Jill Lane	Massachusetts Ave	72	6	10	\$259	\$5,172	6	0%	0%	6
8	San Diego	I-15	I-805	Boundary St	69	5	49	\$765	\$5,937	1	0%	0%	1
								<u>\$5,937</u>					

Notes:

PI, Priority Index = ("Noise Level" minus 67) squared times "Average Reduction" times "Living Units" divided by "Total Cost"

Adjusted PI = PI plus "Percent Residents that Predate the Freeway" plus "Percent Local Contribution"

The SANDAG Board of Directors has made \$1,982,000 of 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds available for freeway noise barriers.

Projects #1 through #3 would receive funding from the 2002 STIP funding cycle.

Project #3 (Oceanside: Hillside Ln to California St) would be funded in the amount of \$686,000 due to funding constraints.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **4**

Action Requested: APPROVE

HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER RETROFIT PROGRAM

Introduction

Noise levels exceed state and federal criteria at numerous residential locations adjacent to existing highways in the San Diego region. Passage of Senate Bill 45 (Kopp) in 1997 delegated the responsibility of addressing existing highway noise impacts on residential areas from the state to the regions. In 1998, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a policy for addressing existing highway noise issues and later amended this policy in 2001 (see Attachment 1). In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors programmed \$1,982,000 toward the construction of three noise barriers; two in the City of Oceanside adjacent to Interstate 5 (I-5), and one in the City of La Mesa adjacent to State Route (SR) 94.

In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors also approved a Use-It-or-Lose-It policy requiring the award of a construction contract for the three noise barriers within two years of the programming of the funding. Due to state transportation budget shortfalls, these funds were not programmed until November 2002. Also due to the state transportation budget shortfall, Caltrans has been unable to provide the staff resources needed to advance the projects. The Cities of Oceanside and La Mesa elected to wait until Caltrans was able to work on the projects instead of seeking consultant assistance.

The cost to construct the noise barriers has increased. The cost increases exceed the available programmed funds, and additional funds would be required to complete these noise barrier projects. The extension of the *TransNet* sales tax program is a possible source of funding for the Oceanside noise barriers. These noise barriers are being assessed as part of the I-5 North Coast project. The I-5 project was designated part of the *TransNet* Early Action Program by the SANDAG Board of Directors in January 2005.

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) discussed these issues at their March 3, 2005, meeting.

Recommendation

CTAC recommends that the Transportation Committee: (1) waive the Use-it-or-Lose-it policy for the three noise barriers due to staff resource impacts caused by the state transportation budget shortfall; (2) reallocate \$1,481,000 of the original \$1,982,000 to fully fund the La Mesa noise barrier project; (3) hold the remaining \$501,000 from the original \$1,982,000 in reserve for future noise barrier project funding cycles; and (4) program \$1,977,000 from the I-5 North Coast *TransNet* Early Action Program budget to fully fund the two Oceanside noise barrier projects.

Discussion

I-5 North Coast Project

The I-5 North Coast project will widen 26 miles of I-5 from Genesee Avenue in the City of San Diego to Vandegrift Boulevard in the City of Oceanside. Noise barriers will be required as part of this project. Caltrans expects to receive environmental clearance for this project in 2007 with freeway widening beginning in 2009. As part of the stage construction strategy and when feasible, Caltrans plans to build the required noise barriers ahead of the freeway widening. This will provide the benefits of the noise barriers through the freeway widening construction period. Caltrans plans to start building the Oceanside noise barriers in 2007.

The I-5 noise barriers in Oceanside will be addressed as a mitigation measure for the I-5 North Coast project. It is therefore appropriate to program *TransNet* Early Action Program funds for this purpose. All appropriate state and federal noise abatement protocol will be followed.

Cost Increases

The original 2002 cost estimates for the noise barriers were defined the Noise Barrier Scope and Summary Report (NBSSR) prepared by Oceanside and La Mesa. The NBSSRs were reviewed and approved by Caltrans per the SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy. The revised costs are shown in the tables below in 2007 dollars, the expected year of construction. These are the values that should be used for programming purposes.

La Mesa Noise Barrier Project

	Original Costs	Revised Costs	Increase
Engineering	Not available	\$487,000	
Right-of-Way	Not available	\$133,000	
Construction	Not available	\$861,000	
Total	\$738,000	\$1,481,000	100%

Oceanside Noise Barrier Projects

	Original Costs	Revised Costs	Increase
Engineering	Not available	\$608,000	
Right-of-Way	Not available	\$18,000	
Construction	Not available	\$1,351,000	
Total	\$1,275,000	\$1,977,000	55%

The revised cost of the La Mesa and Oceanside noise barriers have increased 100 percent and 55 percent, respectively. According to the Caltrans Contract Item Cost Data, masonry block sound wall costs have increased 19 percent since 2002. The cost estimates provided in the NBSSRs did not provide detailed estimates for engineering, right-of-way, and construction costs. Engineering and right-of-way, in addition to construction, are eligible expenditures as defined by the SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy. It also is also not clear if the original cost estimates were escalated to the year of construction. Staff recommends that all future NBSSRs contain detailed cost estimates that are escalated to the year of construction.

Options

The following options also are presented for Transportation Committee consideration:

Option 1 is similar to CTAC's recommendation, except instead of holding \$501,000 in reserve, as defined in part (3) of the recommendation, allocate these funds to the next project on the 2002 priority list, shown on Attachment 2. This would be the National City noise barrier project adjacent to I-805 at Plaza Boulevard. Caltrans estimates the revised cost of this noise barrier is \$1,370,000. The City of National City is currently pursuing other funding sources that would provide the rest of the funding for this project.

Option 2 would enforce the Use-It-or-Lose-It policy and reallocate the total \$1,982,000 in funding to other high priority transportation projects. Funding shortfalls exist on a number of high priority transportation projects, including improvements to I-15, SR 76, SR 905, and Mid-Coast LRT.

JACK BODA
Director, Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Richard Chavez, (619) 699-6989; rch@sandag.org

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

1. **Fund Allocation:** SANDAG will allocate up to one percent (1%) of the funds available through the State Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Improvement Program (STIP-RIP) each cycle to fund eligible retrofit noise barriers. Each STIP-RIP cycle, the local jurisdictions are required to submit a request for their candidate retrofit noise barriers to SANDAG for funding consideration. The request must document that at least two-thirds of the residences immediately adjacent to the freeway desire installation of the noise barrier. The local jurisdictions are required to provide all engineering and right-of-way services, including construction contract administration, unless arrangements are made with Caltrans. The local jurisdictions are required to address long-term noise barrier maintenance issues to the satisfaction of Caltrans prior to funding allocation by SANDAG.

Funds will be allocated to the noise barrier(s) with the highest Priority Index number as determined by the Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Caltrans will maintain a two tier Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List. Funds will only be allocated to Tier one noise barriers.

STIP-RIP funds are programmed by SANDAG and administered by Caltrans. STIP-RIP funds are transferred by Caltrans to the local jurisdiction on a reimbursement basis. Strict use-it-or-lose-it rules apply to STIP-RIP funds, as defined in the STIP Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

2. **Eligibility:** Qualifying conditions are limited to residential areas with outdoor areas of frequent use immediately adjacent to existing interstate freeways or state highways where noise levels exceed 67 decibels (measured as the energy-average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a one hour period, dBA, Leq(h)). A retrofit noise barrier must meet minimum state and federal standards to be added to the Caltrans maintained Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

Barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List must be cost effective. The cost effectiveness criterion is established as \$45,000 per benefited living unit for the 2002 STIP-RIP funding cycle. This criterion will be adjusted for future STIP-RIP cycles by using the California Construction Cost Index as a guide. The noise barrier's cost effectiveness calculation should include all living units (i.e., houses, apartments, and condominiums) that will benefit by a reduction of 5 dBA or more as a result of the noise barrier construction. The noise barrier cost used in making the cost-effectiveness calculation should be the same as that used for calculating the Priority Index.

Noise barriers identified as part of an environmental document for noise abatement purposes for highway improvement or residential development projects will not be eligible for STIP-RIP funding as a retrofit noise barrier. All new highway projects will include noise barriers in accordance with state and federal policy. All new residential developments adjacent to highways will include noise barriers in accordance with state and local policy.

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

3. **Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List:** Caltrans will develop and maintain a comprehensive list of noise barrier needs in the region. Caltrans will perform field noise measurements as needed. Caltrans will maintain a two-tiered list: Tier one will consist of proposed noise barriers that have a completed Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Tier two will consist of proposed noise barriers that have no NBSSR. Noise barriers in Tier one will be listed in order, based upon their Priority Index numbers. Noise barriers in Tier two will be listed in order, based upon measured noise levels.
4. **Noise Barrier Scope and Summary Report (NBSSR):** The local jurisdictions are responsible for funding and completing the NBSSR. Caltrans is responsible for reviewing and approving the NBSSR. The noise barrier will be advanced from Tier two to Tier one once the NBSSR is approved by Caltrans. Proposed noise barriers must not conflict with projects currently programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Long-term maintenance strategies must be included in the NBSSR. NBSSR guidelines can be found in the Caltrans Design Program Web site at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd. The guidelines are in the Appendix F of the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) that is listed under the Manuals/Guidance/Design Topics heading on the Web site.
5. **Noise Barrier Requests:** Caltrans will investigate all noise barrier requests and maintain a log. The log will be shared with the local jurisdictions and SANDAG on a quarterly basis. The local jurisdictions are responsible to update their contact person information with Caltrans. Caltrans will develop and maintain an educational pamphlet about noise barriers for distribution purposes. If a requested noise barrier does not meet the minimum standards, Caltrans will send the educational pamphlet to the requester.
6. **Priority Index (PI) Calculation:** The PI is used for ranking Tier one noise barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

$$PI = (NL-67)^2 * AR * LU / \text{Cost (in \$1,000)}$$

NL: Is the average of the field-measured noise levels, dBA, Leq(h).

AR: Is the average reduction in noise levels that the proposed noise barrier will achieve. The NAC of 67dBA, Leq(h), is a goal for achievement, but is not mandatory. However, any noise barrier considered under this program must provide a minimum of 5 dBA noise reduction.

LU: Is the number of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway (i.e., first-line receivers). Residences located above the first floor in multistory units are included in the living unit count only if the proposed barrier will provide a 5dBA reduction for these units.

Cost: The noise barrier cost in \$1,000's includes all costs directly related to the proposed noise barriers. This includes items for engineering, right-of-way, earthwork, drainage, traffic control, structure work, planting, and other specialty work, as well as the noise barrier itself.

SANDAG Noise Barrier Retrofit Policy

Approved: November 16, 2001

For projects that include noise barriers at multiple locations, the overall project's PI is calculated independently for each location. The PI for the combined project is calculated using a weighted average method, with the weighting based on the number of living units at each location.

7. **Priority Index (PI) Adjustment:** A major factor for determining priority is the percentage of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway where occupants have resided there since the time the highway opened. The local jurisdiction in which the residential area is located is responsible for providing documentation on percentage of living units with original occupants still residing immediately adjacent to the highway.

PI calculated by the above formula is enhanced by an amount equal to the actual percentage of living units with occupants currently still residing there. For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.00 and the documentation furnished by the local agency indicates that the current qualifying living unit percentage is 52.5 percent, then the priority index is adjusted to 62.5.

If the current occupant or occupants are the owners, then the date of purchase is used as documentation. For rental and leased properties, a statement is obtained from the landlord of the date occupancy commenced.

Another factor for determining priority is the level of contribution from the local jurisdiction. The PI is enhanced by half the percentage of local jurisdiction contribution towards the noise barrier cost up to a maximum of 33 percent (i.e., a maximum of 16.5 points). For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.0 and the local jurisdiction contributes 30 percent of the cost, then the priority index is adjusted to 25.0. A noise barrier may qualify for both an enhancement for residents that predate the highway and for a local jurisdiction contribution.

The cost used for determining the level of contribution is the same as for determining the PI, minus the cost of the NBSSR. No PI adjustment is given for local jurisdiction costs associated with completion of the NBSSR, as this is a basic program requirement. Resolution of the city council or Board of Supervisors demonstrates a contribution.

8. **Eligible Expenditures:** Only project features directly attributable to a retrofit noise barrier incurred after the noise barrier has been programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) are eligible for funding. Acceptable project features include drainage modification, earthwork, safety treatments, miscellaneous asphalt paving, landscaping, traffic control and right-of-way acquisition that is directly related to and needed for proper installation of the noise barrier. Support costs (development of final engineering plans, environmental clearance, right-of-way appraisal, construction management) are eligible for funding. Inappropriate project features include maintenance, upgrades, or enhancements to the adjacent residence or roadway, roadway slopes, or roadway features.

Noise Barrier Project Proposals

City	Route	From	To	Noise Level	Average Reduction	Living Units	Total Cost (thousands)	Cumulative Cost (thousands)	PI	Percent Residents Predate Freeway	Percent Local Contribution	Adjusted PI	
1	Oceanside	I-5	Whaley St	California St	72	10	17	\$558	\$558	8	29%	0%	37
2	La Mesa	SR-94	Waite Dr	Massachusetts Ave	77	12	12	\$738	\$1,296	20	0%	0%	20
3	Oceanside	I-5	Hillside Ln	California St	74	5	16	\$717	\$2,013	5	13%	0%	18
4	National City	I-805	Plaza Blvd	4th Street	74	7	37	\$886	\$2,899	14	0%	0%	14
5	El Cajon	I-8	SR-67	Mollison Ave	73	8	42	\$1,709	\$4,608	7	2%	0%	9
6	La Mesa	SR-94	69th St	King St	74	7	8	\$305	\$4,913	9	0%	0%	9
7	La Mesa	SR-94	Jill Lane	Massachusetts Ave	72	6	10	\$259	\$5,172	6	0%	0%	6
8	San Diego	I-15	I-805	Boundary St	69	5	49	\$765	\$5,937	1	0%	0%	1
								<u><u>\$5,937</u></u>					

Notes:

PI, Priority Index = ("Noise Level" minus 67) squared times "Average Reduction" times "Living Units" divided by "Total Cost"

Adjusted PI = PI plus "Percent Residents that Predate the Freeway" plus "Percent Local Contribution"

The SANDAG Board of Directors has made \$1,982,000 of 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds available for freeway noise barriers.

Projects #1 through #3 would receive funding from the 2002 STIP funding cycle.

Project #3 (Oceanside: Hillside Ln to California St) would be funded in the amount of \$686,000 due to funding constraints.

San Diego Association of Governments

**JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES**

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **B**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Introduction

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the creation of the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) on November 19, 2004, to review and provide input into key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SANDAG Board approved the membership of the SWG on January 28, 2005.

The SWG will act in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on specific RCP and RTP activities, including the development of the smart growth concept map, the smart growth incentive program, land use and transportation performance indicators and targets, and the RTP update.

To date, the SWG has met twice. This report provides information on the group's work to date, including the upcoming election of two vice chairs, who will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Discussion

Topics Discussed to Date

At its first two meetings in February and March, the SWG received background presentations on SANDAG, the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the current RTP (MOBILITY 2030), the integration of the RCP implementation and the RTP update, and the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Additionally, the SWG approved a Charter describing its purpose, responsibilities, and membership. Finally, the Working Group provided comments on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, which will be relayed to the Committees as part of Agenda Item D.

Vice Chairs

Upon creating the SWG, the SANDAG Board of Directors appointed Councilmember Jack Dale of Santee as the Chair of the group. At its next meeting, the SWG members will elect two vice chairs.

The vice chairs will represent the SWG in an advisory capacity at future Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee meetings. A representative from the previous SWG, which was created to advise the Regional Planning Committee on the development of the RCP, served in an advisory capacity on the Regional Planning Committee, creating a direct link between the SWG and the RPC. The direct representation was helpful in relaying the SWG's perspectives, and complemented the direct representation from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

The SWG is scheduled to elect a first and second vice chair at its April 19, 2005, meeting, and those individuals will begin representing the SWG at the Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meetings in May 2005.

BOB LEITER
Director of land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989; cgr@sandag.org

JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **C**

Action Requested: ACCEPT

WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE

Introduction

SANDAG staff has prepared a draft work program and schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030. The last update was completed in March 2003, and the next regularly scheduled update would occur in March 2006. Existing federal legislation requires SANDAG to make an air quality conformity determination of the long-range transportation plan every three years.

However, pending language in the federal transportation reauthorization legislation would change the normal update cycle to four years. This bill was passed by the House and sent to the Senate in mid-March. In addition, with an extended four-year cycle, staff proposes to develop a more comprehensive update of the RTP in 2007, incorporating a new regional growth forecast, strategic initiatives from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review, and the funding impact of the *TransNet* extension. As a result, staff has developed a work program to produce both a technical RTP update in 2006 and a comprehensive RTP update in 2007. The Stakeholders Working Group provided initial feedback to the RTP Work Program on March 15, 2005.

Recommendation

This report provides the draft work program to update the Regional Transportation Plan in 2006 and again in 2007. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to provide any additional comments and accept the draft RTP work program, schedule, and issue papers.

Discussion

Overall Work Program

Staff will provide an overview of the preliminary elements and schedules for the concurrent RTP updates. If the federal transportation legislation is reauthorized in the near future, the need for a 2006 RTP update could be eliminated. In that case, staff would focus its efforts on the issues and products necessary for the comprehensive 2007 RTP update.

Included with this item are five attachments. Attachment 1 is the 2006 RTP Schedule, and Attachment 2 is the 2007 RTP Schedule. Attachment 3, "2007 RTP Issue Papers," provides more

detail and the envisioned schedule for the various special analyses that would feed into the 2007 RTP. As they are developed over the course of the next year, these issues will be brought for discussion to the various working groups and the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Attachment 4, "RTP Work Program – 2006 and 2007 Updates," outlines the major tasks and time frames associated with both the 2006 and 2007 RTP updates. Finally, Attachment 5, "2006 and 2007 RTP Milestones," depicts the projected dates when milestone products or issues would be available for final review or action.

2007 RTP Issue Papers

SANDAG staff intends to produce several issue papers related to the development of the 2007 RTP. These papers highlight several of the unique inputs and analyses that will enhance the development of the RTP. A brief description of each issue paper and anticipated production schedule is shown on Attachment 3.

For example, two efforts are beginning that are independent of the RTP, but whose results will be incorporated into the 2007 RTP update. The first is the Independent Transit Planning Review, already scheduled to be conducted in 2005; this review is a follow-up action to the *TransNet* extension that was approved in November 2004. The results of this review will affect the transit network and service assumptions in the 2007 RTP. The second effort—Habitat Planning Issues—also is a result of the extension of *TransNet*, as work begins to set up habitat mitigation banks related to the development of transportation projects and identified funding.

Several other topics are routinely updated along with any RTP, but have a new focus with the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2004. They include land use forecasts, which include the Smart Growth Concept Map currently under development, a review of the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria, and an update of the Regional Arterial System. However, the preparation of a Regional Freight Strategy is a new component under development specifically for the 2007 RTP.

Five other issue papers cover new areas or expansion of recent studies. They are Cross-Border Travel, Interregional Travel, Energy Demand and Infrastructure, Tribal Development Issues, and Public Safety/Homeland Security.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix (619) 699-1977; mhi@sandag.org

2006 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

MAJOR TASKS	2005												2006												2007		
	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	
Update Revenue Scenarios	█	█	█	█																							
Update Project Costs & Phasing	█	█	█	█																							
Create Scenarios and EIR Alternatives				█	█																						
Prepare Draft RTP					█	█	█	█	█	█																	
Prepare Draft EIR		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█																
Public Hearing											█																
Draft Final RTP												█	█														
Adopt Final RTP														█													

2007 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

MAJOR TASKS	2005												2006												2007		
	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	
	Issue Papers												(See detailed breakout - Attachment 3)														
GP/Alternate Land Use Forecasts																											
Update Project Evaluation Criteria																											
Update Performance Indicators																											
Alternatives Analysis																											
Review Revenues and Costs																											
Create Scenarios and EIR Alternatives																											
Prepare Draft RTP																											
Prepare Draft EIR																											
Public Hearing																											
Draft Final RTP																											
Adopt Final RTP																											

2007 RTP - Issue Papers Schedule

TOPICS	2005												2006												2007		
	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	
Independent Transit Planning Review																											
Regional Freight Strategy																											
Regional Arterial System																											
Smart Growth Concept Map																											
Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria																											
Cross - Border Travel																											
Interregional Travel																											
Energy Demand and Infrastructure																											
Tribal Development Issues																											
Habitat Planning Issues																											
Public Safety & Homeland Security																											

2007 RTP Issue Papers

Brief descriptions of topics to be covered in each issue paper are listed below. They have been grouped into the four major components of mobility from the 2030 MOBILITY RTP. Feedback from a March 15, 2005 meeting with the Stakeholders Working Group has been incorporated.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Independent Transit Planning Review. The reassessment of the MOBILITY 2030 Transit Network would be completed by December 2005. The study involves a consultant and peer review group. At its completion, alternative networks may be recommended for analysis. This work should be done by March 2006 so that the entire transit/highway/arterial networks can be reviewed and go to the Board for inclusion in the draft RTP. In relation to the Independent Transit Review, members of the Stakeholders WG want the evaluation to include an evaluation of how well local service will connect with new regional services.
- Regional Freight Strategy. Staff will coordinate with rail, truck, ship, air, and pipeline infrastructure providers and users to develop a long-range and integrated freight strategy for the region. The individual modal assessment will be completed for the 2006 RTP Update. The intermodal strategy will be completed for the 2007 RTP.
- Regional Arterial System. The definition of a regional arterial and the selection of the Regionally Significant Arterial System should be reviewed and updated for the 2007 RTP. This should be done in context of the future *TransNet* development fee for regional facilities.
- Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria. This task is two-fold. First, SANDAG should develop a process to prioritize regional corridors for future improvements. Second, the existing project evaluation criteria in the RTP should be updated, giving more consideration to transportation projects that are tied to and promote smart growth development. Another category of projects that will have specialized evaluation criteria are Rail Grade Separation projects. The development of this issue paper also should consider whether intermodal projects from the regional freight strategy can be prioritized with other regional projects or should be considered separately. The criteria would be used to develop the networks for the 2007 RTP funding scenarios.

LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION CONNECTION ISSUE PAPERS

- Smart Growth Concept Map. A preliminary Smart Growth Concept Map, which illustrates locations where smart growth land uses are already planned or should be considered by local jurisdictions as they update their general plans, is expected to be completed by June 2005, with a final map to be completed by September 2005. This time frame would give staff the opportunity to create and discuss smart growth land use alternatives for analysis in the 2007 RTP.

- Cross-Border Transportation Issues. Given increasing development across the border in Baja California, this issue paper would assess the transportation impacts of cross-border travel. It would include the impacts of the new East Otay Mesa POE on the location of planned BRT routes and commercial inspection facilities.
- Interregional Transportation Issues. SANDAG staff is currently working with staff of the Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Caltrans on Phase II studies of the I-15 corridor. These studies will include an evaluation of potential for increasing job opportunities in Riverside County, increased housing opportunities in San Diego County, and specific transportation facility and service improvements that should be planned to serve existing and future commuting patterns on the I-15 corridor. The outcomes of these studies would be presented. In addition, this issue paper will address the growing stock of housing in Imperial County and the travel to and from the San Diego region. What impacts does this recent trend have on the regional transportation system?
- Habitat Planning Issues. The new *TransNet*-funded Environmental Mitigation Program is intended to improve the preservation of habitat areas associated with regional transportation projects. How will the new program be implemented related to identified Early-Action *TransNet* Projects and other projects in the 2007 RTP identified for early development?
- Tribal Reservation Development Issues. New development on tribal reservations has caused traffic impacts in rural areas. How can the region better assess the potential impacts on regional facilities from reservation development and plan for the transportation facilities needed to avoid related congestion? The analysis would be done in collaboration with the individual tribes to assess the existing and planned land uses on tribal lands, and incorporate to the greatest degree possible the travel generated from these sources along with the rest of the regional inputs.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Energy Demand and Infrastructure. What types of Transportation Demand Strategies can affect the energy demands of the region for the movement of people and goods? As the cost of energy goes up, how can the region reduce its demand for transportation-related energy and the resulting pollutants? Can transportation corridors also serve as energy/utility corridors?

SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Public Safety and Homeland Security. This issue paper will evaluate the impacts of Homeland Security directives on the regional transportation system, as well as looking at issues related to improving safety on the highways and transit system. One issue of public safety brought up at the Stakeholders' WG meeting was developing a regional strategy to deal with planned or unplanned events which shut down a major transportation corridor or facility.

RTP Work Program – 2006 and 2007 Updates

1. ***Establish Work Program*** (March 2005)
 - 2006 RTP based on federal 3-year cycle; includes only updated funding scenarios based on revised revenue projections and project cost estimates; 2007 RTP intended to be comprehensive and incorporate better land use and transportation coordination, as outlined in the RCP.
 - 2006 RTP based on federal 3-year cycle; includes only updated funding scenarios based on revised revenue projections and project cost estimates; 2007 RTP intended to be comprehensive and incorporate better land use and transportation coordination, as outlined in the RCP.
 - Review work program with SWG, RPTWG, CTAC (March 2005).
 - Take to the Transportation Committee / Regional Planning Committee (April 1, 2005).

2. ***Review RTP Goals and Policy Objectives*** (June 2005)
 - Incorporate RCP directives and Strategic Initiatives.
 - Incorporate Caltrans RTP Supplement guidelines.
 - Obtain direction from the Board for 2007 RTP (June 2005).

3. ***Develop and Review Issue Papers*** (March 2005–June 2006). These reports will be reviewed by the advisory and policy committees. Attachment 3 discusses these topics and their content in more detail.

4. ***Public Outreach and Involvement***
 - Subregional workshops for the 2006 **and** 2007 RTP.
 - Mini-grants for outreach to minority/low income groups.
 - Work with communications staff to schedule events and outreach products; bring results to TC/RPC.

5. ***Update Revenue and Project Cost Projections, with improved operating forecasts***
 - Incorporate improved operating costs in the projections, as directed by Federal Highways and Federal Transit Administration after the 2003 RTP.
 - For 2006 RTP, select new base year to be used for both the 2006 and 2007 RTPs. Update project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios, incorporating the *TransNet* extension (May 2005).
 - For 2007 RTP, review project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios, incorporating *TransNet* II and TEA-LU, if new legislation is passed (June 2006).

6. ***Incorporate recommendations from Corridor/Subarea Studies/Deficiency Plans for 2007 RTP*** (June 2006). These studies could possibly be summarized as an issue paper(s) and brought to the Working Groups for review.
 - I-805 Corridor and Direct Access Ramp (DAR) study
 - I-5 North Coast
 - Central I-5 HOV analysis
 - North South Transportation Corridor Analysis
7. ***Update Land Use Forecasts for 2007 RTP*** (January 2005 – March 2006)
 - Create Capacity File for Existing Plans and Policies (July 2005).
 - Generate New Existing Policies Forecast (December 2005).
 - Use Smart Growth Land Use Concept Map from September 2005 to generate land use alternative(s) for 2007 RTP analysis (March 2006).
 - Internal SANDAG Review of Existing Plans and Policies (March 2006).
 - Board Accept Land Use Plan for use in the 2007 RTP (April 2006).
8. ***Update Performance Indicators***
 - The performance indicators used to measure the success of transit and highway networks should be reevaluated and updated to be consistent with the goals and policy objectives of the Board (February 2006).
 - Update base year and projected Levels of Service, travel time, speed and other indicator data for the 2007 RTP (March – August 2006).
9. ***Develop Network and/or Land Use Alternatives***
 - 2006 RTP – Develop EIR alternatives to include SOFAR agreement (March – June 2005).
 - 2007 RTP – Land Use and network alternatives need to be developed by March 2006. Recommended changes and analyses from the Independent Transit Planning Review need to be developed in time to meet these deadlines.
10. ***Analyze Alternatives and Select Preferred Unconstrained Network for 2007 RTP*** (March – June 2006)
 - Perform travel forecasts.
 - Apply updated performance measures, such as overall LOS and average corridor travel times, to provide a grid of overall effectiveness of each alternative.
 - Select Preferred Network; review with WGs, Committees and gain Board approval (June 2006).

11. *Update Network Phasing*

- Create new Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios.
- Employ revised evaluation criteria to assist in project selection for 2007 RTP scenarios.
- Review with Working Groups and gain approval from TC and Board.

12. *Perform Air Quality (AQ) forecasts*

- Address FTA/FHWA requirement for better documentation on SOV alternatives for AQ analysis.
- Follows the selection of the Revenue Constrained scenario of the preferred network alternative.
- AQ for 2006 RTP provided along with draft EIR (Nov 2005); revisions for final RTP (March 2006).
- AQ for 2007 RTP provided along with draft EIR (Nov 2006); revisions for final RTP (March 2007).

13. *Produce Draft RTP*

- Preliminary drafts sent to Transportation Committee in August.
- RTP 2006; include updated base-year data as available (October 2005).
- RTP 2007 (October 2006).

14. *EIR Preparation*

- EIR for RTP 2006 incorporating agreed-upon SOFAR alternative; draft EIR (Nov 2005); final (March 2006).
- Updated EIR for RTP 2007, draft EIR (Nov 2006); final (March 2007).

15. *Revised Draft Final RTP*

- RTP 2006 (February 2006).
- RTP 2007 (February 2007).

16. *Final RTP/EIR Adoption*

- RTP 2006 (March 2006).
- RTP 2007 (March 2007).

17. *Air Quality Conformity*

- RTP 2006 (April 2006).
- RTP 2007 (April 2007).

Committees and Working Groups							
MILESTONES	CTAC	TWG	SWG	RPC	TC	BOD	Public Workshops
RTP Work Program	Apr-05	Mar-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	Apr-05	Apr-05	
2007 Revised Goals and Policies						Jun-05	
2006 Network/Funding Alts	May-05	May-05	May-05	Jun-05	Jun-05	Jun-05	
2006 Prelim Draft RTP					Aug-05	Aug-05	Jul-05
2006 Draft RTP					Oct-05	Oct-05	
2006 Draft EIR					Nov-05		
Public Hearing RTP/EIR					Dec-05		
Results of Public Outreach				Jan-06	Jan-06	Jan-06	
Draft RTP Changes					Jan-06	Jan-06	
2006 Draft Final RTP					Feb-06	Feb-06	
Adopt Final 2006 RTP/EIR						Mar-06	
Air Quality Conformity Finding						Apr-06	
Issue Papers:							
Regional Freight Strategy:							
Modal Plans	Jun-05		Jun-05		Jul-05		
Intermodal Strategy	May-06		May-06		Jun-06		
Smart Growth Concept Map	Aug-05	Aug-05	Aug-05	Sep-05	Sep-05	Sep-05	
Cross-Border Travel	Nov-05	Nov-05	Nov-05	Dec-05	Dec-05		
Ind Transit Planning Review	Dec-05		Dec-05		Dec-05		
Regional Arterial System	Feb-06		Feb-06		Mar-06		
Interregional Travel	Feb-06	Feb-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Mar-06		
Tribal Development Impacts	Feb-06	Feb-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Mar-06		
Corridor/Project Evaluation Criteria	Feb-06	Feb-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Mar-06	Apr-06	
Energy Impacts	May-06	May-06	May-06	Jun-06	Jun-06		
Habitat Planning							
Public Safety/Homeland Sec							
Updated Performance Indicators	Dec-05	Dec-05	Dec-05	Jan-06	Jan-06	Feb-06	Feb-06*
Updated Land Use Forecasts	Mar-06	Mar-06	Mar-06	Mar-06	Mar-06	Apr-06	
Project Evaluation Criteria	Feb-06	Feb-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Mar-06	Apr-06	
2007 Network/Funding Alts	May-06	May-06	May-06	Jun-06	Jun-06	Jun-06	
2007 Prelim Draft RTP					Aug-06	Aug-06	Jul-06
2007 Draft RTP					Oct-06	Oct-06	
2007 Draft EIR					Nov-06		
Public Hearing RTP/EIR					Dec-06		
Results of Public Outreach				Jan-07	Jan-07	Jan-07	
Draft RTP Changes					Jan-07	Jan-07	
2007 Draft Final RTP					Feb-07	Feb-07	
Adopt Final 2007 RTP/EIR						Mar-07	
Air Quality Conformity Finding						Apr-07	

*Public Workshop regarding draft issues papers and performance indicators.

JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **D**

Action Requested: COMMENT

PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) was originally proposed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030. It is a precursor to the longer term smart growth incentive program called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan that will be funded by the *TransNet* extension. An *ad hoc* working group consisting of members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) (local planning directors) and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) (local public works directors) has been collaborating with SANDAG staff to develop project evaluation criteria for the Pilot SGIP. Coronado Councilmember Monroe also has participated on the *ad hoc* working group on behalf of the Transportation Committee.

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees discussed the draft project evaluation criteria for the pilot program at their joint meeting on January 21, 2005. Since then, the draft evaluation criteria have been further discussed by the TWG, CTAC, and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. At its March 3, 2005, meeting, CTAC recommended approval of the draft evaluation criteria. The TWG did not have time to fully discuss the criteria at its March 10 meeting, and postponed action on the item to its April 14 meeting.

On February 25, 2005, in conjunction with its approval of the final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle, the Board of Directors directed staff to modify the Pilot SGIP project evaluation criteria to award "bonus points" for certain cities with higher percentages of lower income households. The bonus points are to be awarded to jurisdictions whose 1999 percentage of lower income households is higher than the regional average. The draft project evaluation criteria included in Attachment 1 reflect the Board's policy directive. Attachment 2 is a copy of the memorandum approved by the Board as part of its February 25 action on the RHNA.

Recommendation

This report provides a progress update on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to provide any additional comments on the draft project evaluation criteria and program guidelines.

Discussion

Program Guidelines

The draft program guidelines (Attachment 1) were developed to meet the requirements of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program that will be the funding source for the Pilot SGIP. The guidelines also establish the application requirements, the evaluation criteria, and project selection process. In general terms, they also provide guidance on how the evaluation criteria will be applied to score and rank candidate projects. An application form is being developed to ensure that each application includes the information needed for a thorough evaluation of the projects.

As currently proposed, the guidelines would limit grant funding to a maximum of \$2 million per project. The guidelines also include "Use-it-or-Lose-it" requirements that apply to all grant recipients.

Project Evaluation Criteria

The project evaluation criteria matrix (pages 1-6 to 1-7 of Attachment 1) includes a project-specific criterion for affordable housing (Criterion B5 – Affordable Housing). This criterion was added based on the direction provided by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees at their joint meeting in January 2005. In addition, the matrix awards additional bonus points for certain cities with higher percentages of low income households. This is consistent with the direction provided by the Board as part of its February 25, 2005, RHNA approval.

The evaluation matrix is divided into the following categories: Project Readiness, Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics, Quality of Proposed Project, Matching Funds, and Low Income Household Bonus. The weighting factors distribute the points between these categories as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total Points</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Project Readiness	15	11%
Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics	45	33%
Quality of Proposed Project	40	30%
Matching Funds	15	11%
Low Income Household Bonus	<u>20</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	135	100%

Remaining Issues to be Addressed

Regional Planning Technical Working Group Discussion

Two substantive issues remain under discussion. First, some members of the TWG have recommended that the evaluation criteria place greater emphasis on projects that support higher density land development. Because community acceptance of higher density development is often the biggest impediment to developing a smart growth project, some TWG members felt that the Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development) should receive a higher weight. Intensity of related development currently accounts for 7 percent of the total 135 points.

Second, some TWG members also expressed concern that the mandated Low Income Household Bonus points for lower income households (Criterion E) might result in the selection of projects that are not “ready to go.” As currently proposed, this bonus would award 20 points to certain cities (15 percent of the 135 total points).

Ad Hoc Working Group Discussion

The *ad hoc* working group that has been helping to develop the Pilot SGIP criteria and guidelines reconvened to address both of these outstanding issues. They agreed that a higher weight factor should be applied to Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development). However, the group did not reach consensus on whether that factor should be increased from a weight factor of two (as currently proposed) to a weight factor of three or four. The *ad hoc* group referred the matter to the TWG for resolution at its April 14 meeting.

The *ad hoc* working group discussed the Low Income Household Bonus (Criterion E) and agreed that it would not adversely impact potential “ready to go” candidate projects. As currently proposed, Project Readiness (Criterion A) would be worth 15 of the total of 135 points (11 percent). Prior to the addition of the Low Income Household Bonus, the Project Readiness accounted for 13 percent of the total points available. The proposed project evaluation criteria were developed to select projects that address a variety of regional goals. The projects that address more of these goals, and do it well, will be the ones that rise to the top. If the proposed evaluation criteria function as envisioned, no single criterion will bias the evaluation process.

Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Discussion

In addition to the comments from the TWG, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) discussed the draft project evaluation criteria at its March 15, 2005, meeting. Members of the SWG provided the following comments:

- Raise the maximum grant amount beyond the \$2 million per project limit currently proposed.
- The requirement for projects to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) may prevent certain “ready to go” candidate projects from competing for the pilot program funding.
- Consider rewarding projects that serve greater numbers of people.
- Consider rewarding projects that support reverse commuting.

The recommended \$2 million per project limit was based on a survey of local jurisdiction staff. However, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees may wish to discuss whether a higher grant limit should be permitted for the pilot program. Because federal Transportation Enhancements (TE) monies would fund the Pilot SGIP, compliance with NEPA is mandatory.

One of the proposed criteria already addresses the number of people served. Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development) awards more points to candidate projects that are support areas with higher residential densities.

A specific criterion for projects that support reverse commuting is not proposed. In November 2004, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees approved the proposed approach for the pilot program and agreed that it should focus on implementing smart growth land uses in areas that help support the regional transportation investments envisioned in the RTP – particularly the planned transit system. Under the pilot program, grant funds would be made available to local jurisdictions for projects that help integrate transportation and land use, such as transit-oriented developments and other smart growth projects that make areas more conducive to mixed land uses, walking, and biking.

Federal Transportation Enhancements Program Eligibility

As previously noted, candidate projects for the Pilot SGIP would need to meet the eligibility requirements of the federal TE program. Staff has received inquiries about whether a project that adds parking could be a candidate for the Pilot SGIP. Parking is not an eligible expense under the federal TE program.

As discussed in the draft program guidelines (Attachment 1), project applicants who would like to submit parking improvements for funding should meet with or contact SANDAG staff prior to submitting an application to discuss strategies for how the project might be included in the Pilot SGIP. For instance, it may be possible to swap some of the TE funds with other funding sources that could be applied toward transit-related parking. Or, it may be possible to rearrange the public and private components of a project's financing. For instance, a local jurisdiction may be asking a private land developer to construct sidewalk or streetscape enhancements in exchange for the jurisdiction contributing toward the construction of a parking structure. Because the pedestrian improvements *are* eligible under the TE program, the jurisdiction may be able to revise the agreement with the developer to apply the grant funds to the eligible TE uses.

Project Evaluation Panel

As proposed, the projects would be scored by a project evaluation panel. This panel would include SANDAG staff and individuals selected from the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. The objective is to establish an evaluation panel with individuals familiar with the urban form and design principles of smart growth. SANDAG will recruit panel members with a background in urban design, land development, engineering, public transit, bicycling, and walking. If all those skills cannot be found on the SWG, staff would seek volunteers from the private sector and non-governmental organizations. The panel members should have no connection to any of the projects being evaluated.

Next Steps

Following action by the TWG (expected in April), the Pilot SGIP would come back to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in May. Subject to the approval of these two Committees, the item would be scheduled for the May 27, 2005, Board of Directors meeting agenda.

Once approved, SANDAG would issue a call for projects. Project applicants would have approximately 45 days to submit applications. The project evaluation panel would be formed to review and rank the projects. The panel's recommendations would likely go to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for action during the first week of August.

Following approval, the projects must be submitted as a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment to the California Transportation Commission. This is typically a 90-day process. Following the STIP amendment, successful applicants would be able to begin working with the Caltrans Office of Local Assistance to receive authorization to begin the project.

BOB LEITER

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org



Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (Draft Program Guidelines)

Program Description

The *Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP)* funds transportation infrastructure improvements that support smart growth development. Project types could include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, traffic calming, streetscape enhancements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. These projects should encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit trips; support a community's larger infill development or revitalization effort; and provide for a wider range of transportation choices, improved internal mobility, and stronger sense of place. Funds can be used for preliminary engineering (design and environmental), right-of-way acquisition, and construction.

These Program Guidelines describe the application and call for projects process.

Who Can Apply?

SGIP grants are awarded on a competitive basis. Local governments, transit operators, and other public agencies are eligible recipients of the federal funds. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may be partners with government agencies, but cannot apply directly for the funds. Grant recipients will be required to take the capital project through the federal-aid process with Caltrans Local Assistance and meet both state and SANDAG "use it or lose it" requirements for the funds. In addition, grant recipients may be required to attend a workshop on project implementation and the federal-aid process.

How Much Funding is Available?

There is approximately \$17 million in federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funds available for the Pilot SGIP. Requested grants should range between \$200,000 to \$2 million per project. The TE funds are available for up to 88.53 percent of the total project cost. Applicants must provide a minimum local match of 11.47 percent.

Eligible Activities

Project activities eligible for funding include bicycle and pedestrian paths and bridges; on-street bike lanes; pedestrian plazas; pedestrian street crossings; streetscape enhancements such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, street furniture; traffic calming design features such as pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles; transit stop amenities; way-finding signage; and gateway features. Other project types such as parking also may be eligible provided the TE funds can be swapped for another funding source.

Applicants should check with SANDAG and Caltrans Office of Local Assistance for help determining project eligibility. Regardless of the project type, SANDAG is looking for capital projects that are

well-designed, expand transportation options, result in numerous community benefits, and are part of a community's broader revitalization and development efforts.

Smart Growth Areas

Projects funded by the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program should be in existing or future smart growth areas. SANDAG has just begun the process of working with local jurisdictions to identify these areas as part of the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Until that map is developed, the pilot program will evaluate projects based on criteria that address how well the project area exemplifies the smart growth place type characteristics described in the RCP. These characteristics include mixed use, higher intensity, walkable development that is associated with an existing or planned regional transit facility or transit corridor. Section II-B of the project evaluation criteria addresses these characteristics.

The RCP clearly defines six smart growth place types that require a connection to regional transit service; in addition a rural community smart growth place type also is included. Applicants should be able to classify their project sites within one of these smart growth area types. The selection criteria favor projects in locations where existing or planned development best exemplifies one of those place types.

How Will Projects Be Evaluated?

The primary goal of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is to deliver a set of constructible projects that will serve as models for how public infrastructure funding can be used to encourage smart growth development. To achieve that goal, the evaluation criteria focus on constructability, the qualities and characteristics of the existing or planned land uses and transportation facilities in the project area, the qualities of the project itself, and available matching funds.

The evaluation criteria have two main components: eligibility screening criteria, and project evaluation criteria. Once a project has passed the eligibility screening, it will be scored based on the project evaluation criteria. Each project evaluation criterion is ranked on a scale from 0 to 5. Each criterion is then weighted by a factor from 1 to 3 depending on its relative importance.

The "project," is the capital improvement that would be supported by the Pilot SGIP grant. It could include any number of project types eligible under the federal TE program, including bicycle and pedestrian improvements, streetscape enhancements, enhancements to transit facilities, and other types. A candidate project could include one or more of these types of improvements, and would be evaluated based on how well it proposes to execute each type of improvement.

The eligibility screening and project evaluation criteria are discussed in more detail below.

Section 1: Project Screening Criteria

Project Screening Criteria are primarily used to determine basic program eligibility and ensure that the applicant is committed to the project. Three criteria must be met before a project can be evaluated further: (1) Applicants must provide a resolution authorizing the application and

committing matching funds and staff resources to the project from a local Board or Council; (2) applicants must certify that other necessary funding is committed to the project; and (3) eligibility under the federal funding program guidelines must be met.

Applicants with questions about project eligibility should contact SANDAG (619-699-1924) or Caltrans Office of Local Assistance (858-616-6525). The resolution from the Board or Council may be submitted after the application deadline, provided it is received before the project evaluation panel makes its recommendation on project priorities.

Section 2: Project Evaluation Criteria

PART A. The *Project Readiness* criterion is used to evaluate whether the capital project will be able to meet its schedule as stated in the application. The further along the project is in the project development process, the more points the project would earn. Project Readiness has been weighted so as to reflect the relative importance of this evaluation criterion. Only projects that are ready for construction will score the highest in this category and achieve the full 15 points allotted.

PART B. *Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics* are used to evaluate how well the existing or planned land uses and transportation system characteristics in the project area reflect its smart growth place type. Projects supporting residential development that exceeds minimum density levels for its smart growth place type will score the highest in the *Intensity of Development* category.

In order to achieve the highest score in the *Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area* category, the project must be in an area that provides, or is planned to provide, a mix of uses combined with the appropriate transportation system characteristics. Special emphasis is placed on areas focused around regional transit facilities.

The *Urban Design Characteristics* of the project will be evaluated to determine how well the area reflects the smart growth design principles in the RCP. For additional guidance, refer to SANDAG's *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians*.

The criterion *Related Land Development* evaluates how well new land development or redevelopment directly related to the proposed project reflects smart growth development principles, particularly in terms of providing for additional housing. To be directly related, the project must abut or directly serve the new land development.

Finally, proposed projects directly related to land development that includes *Affordable Housing* will be scored based on the quantity of affordable housing provided. "Affordable housing" means housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between 0 – 80 percent of area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section 6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding source or program.

PART C. *Quality of Proposed Project* scoring is based on an evaluation of the quality of the various kinds of improvements that may be included in project. *Pedestrian Access Improvements* are key components of quality smart growth areas and have been weighted accordingly. Maximum points

in these categories are awarded based on the quality of the project design, and how well the project connects the community and its activity centers to public transit. *Bicycle Access Improvements* will be evaluated similarly.

Transit Facility Improvements will be scored according to how well the candidate project improves the environment for patrons at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at other access points in the immediate vicinity of a transit facility.

Streetscape Enhancements and *Traffic Calming Features* also impact the quality of the project. *Streetscape Enhancements* will be scored according to the quality of the proposed design, and the benefit to the pedestrian environment. *Traffic Calming Features* should effectively reduce vehicle speeds while also enhancing the street environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Finally, *Parking Improvements* ensure that there is an appropriate level of auto access to regional transit and the immediate project area. Projects that include parking will be evaluated on how well the parking is integrated into the community. It should provide enough parking to meet expected demand, taking into account the potential for increases in transit and walking trips. Because parking is not an eligible expense under the TE program, applicants submitting parking improvements for funding should meet with or contact SANDAG staff prior to submitting an application to discuss strategies for how the project might be included in the Pilot SGIP. For instance, it may be possible to swap some of the TE funds with other funding sources (e.g., federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds) that could be applied toward transit-related parking. Or, it may be possible to rearrange the public and private components of a project's financing. For instance, a local jurisdiction may be asking a private land developer to construct sidewalk or streetscape enhancements in exchange for the jurisdiction contributing toward the construction of a parking structure. Because the pedestrian improvements *are* eligible under the TE program, the jurisdiction may wish to revise the agreement with the developer to apply the grant funds to the eligible TE uses.

PART D. *Matching Funds* points are awarded to projects based on the amount of matching funds provided by the local jurisdiction from either public or private sources. Private sources of matching funds must be committed through an approved assessment or development impact fee, developer agreement, or other appropriate sources, and must be available at the time the project will be constructed. Points are awarded by multiplying the percentage of matching funds times a weighting factor of 20, up to a maximum of 15 points. The percentage of matching funds is the ratio of the matching funds to the total SGIP project cost.

Who Will Score The Projects?

A panel that includes SANDAG staff and people chosen from SANDAG's Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will rank the projects. This evaluation panel will include people with knowledge of smart growth design principles and its components. SANDAG will recruit panel members with a background in urban design, land development, engineering, public transit, bicycling, and walking. To the extent possible, the panel also should represent the diverse subareas of the region.

Smart Growth Incentive Program Application Process

Step 1: SANDAG issues a call for projects. Applications will be due within approximately 45 days.

Step 2: Applicants submit a project proposal to SANDAG for funding consideration. The application must be completed in full for the project to be considered for funding.

Step 3: SANDAG staff, with the assistance of Caltrans Office of Local Assistance, will evaluate the projects for funding eligibility. Next, SANDAG will evaluate project proposals with the assistance of the project evaluation panel. The evaluation panel will score each project based on its merits relative to the other projects submitted. Once all the projects have been scored, they will be ranked based on their score. The evaluation panel will then review the project rankings with respect to the following program goals:

- How well do the top-ranked projects represent the various smart growth place types identified in the RCP?
- Do the top-ranked projects demonstrate the viability of smart growth development throughout the San Diego region?

In addition, the panel will recommend a prioritized list of projects for a waiting list. In the event that one or more of the recommended projects loses its funding for failure to meet its delivery schedule or other reason, a project from the waiting list could be funded based on its priority and the amount of funding available.

Step 4: Based on the recommendations of the evaluation panel, and funding availability of the overall program, SANDAG staff will make a funding recommendation to the SANDAG Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Step 5: Following approval of the list of Pilot SGIP projects, SANDAG will submit the projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as an amendment to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This process requires a Caltrans review of the projects, and a 60-day public notice period prior to CTC action.

Step 6: Following the CTC's approval of the STIP amendment, grant recipients will attend a workshop on project implementation and the federal-aid process where SANDAG and Caltrans Office of Local Assistance will discuss their respective roles for the Pilot SGIP. Grantees must comply with SANDAG's Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy for the TE program (attached), and the Federal Highway Administration's federal-aid process.

Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Draft Project Evaluation Criteria

I. Project Screening Criteria		+/-
Project screening criteria are meant to ensure the applicant is committed to the project, that the community supports it, and that it can be constructed within the schedule proposed. These criteria must be met in order for the project to be evaluated further.		
A. Local Commitment/ Authorization	The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the staff resources and matching funds necessary to complete the project as proposed.	
B. Funding Commitment	The applicant must certify that funding for related improvements are in place to ensure the proposed project can be completed within the schedule proposed in the project application.	
C. Funding Eligibility	The project must be eligible under the federal funding program guidelines.	

II. Project Evaluation Criteria

Project evaluation criteria are used to score and rank projects. These criteria are based on the requirements of the funding source, and the goals of the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

	Max. Points	Weight	Max. Score
--	-------------	--------	------------

A. Project Readiness

To ensure the proposed projects can comply with the state's timely use of funds requirements, projects will be scored based on the how close they are to beginning construction.

Level of Project Development (Projects receive 1 point for each completed phase to a maximum of 5 points)				
Feasibility Study	1	3	15	
Preliminary Engineering	1			
Environmental Clearance	1			
Right-of-way Acquisition	1			
Final Design	1			

B. Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics

To encourage projects in smart growth development areas, and to evaluate how well they support smart growth development, the proposed projects are scored based on the intensity of development, the diversity of land uses, the quality of urban design in the project area, the provision of additional housing in general and affordable housing in particular.

1	Intensity of Development (0-5 points)	To what extent does the existing or planned project area meet the residential density levels identified in the RCP for its smart growth area type? Project areas at the minimum dwelling units per acre receive 1 point, and areas at the recommended upper end of the range receive 5 points.	5	2	10
2	Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)	How well does the existing or planned urban form in the project area meet the smart growth objectives of the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas that have, or are planned to have, a mix of residential and commercial uses appropriate to its smart growth area type, and have the appropriate transportation system characteristics.	5	2	10
3	Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)	How well does the existing or planned urban design in the project area conform to the smart growth design principles in the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas where the existing built environment, or the design standards for new construction provides a human-scale built environment. The street network and trail system should provide direct access to commercial and civic services, recreational opportunities, and transportation services. Building construction should be oriented to the pedestrian. Street design should accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including transit passengers.	5	2	10
4	Related Land Development Projects (0-5 points)	Is there a current land development project associated with the proposed capital improvements? How well does it contribute to smart growth development by providing additional housing in the area?	5	1	5
5	Affordable Housing ¹ (0-5 points)	Does the project serve affordable (subsidized) housing? How much additional affordable housing is provided?	5	2	10

Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Draft Project Evaluation Criteria

II. Project Evaluation Criteria (cont'd)

		Max. Points	Weight	Max. Score	
C. Quality of Proposed Project.					
These criteria rate the proposed project based on the variety and quality of features proposed to be constructed. Points are accumulated for each type of improvement included in the project based on the quality of that improvement.					
1	Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)	To what extent does the project improve pedestrian access to a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that connect people to activity centers (especially transit) following the design principles in SANDAG's Planning and Designing for Pedestrians.	5	2	10
2	Bicycle Access Improvements ² (0-5 points)	To what extent does the project improve bicycle access to, and secure parking at a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that provide seamless bicycle access to the areas activity centers, and include secure bicycle parking.	5	1	5
3	Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)	To what extent does the project improve the transit patron environment at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at access points immediately adjacent to the transit facility?	5	2	10
4	Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)	How well does the project include public art elements, public seating, pedestrian-scale lighting, enhanced paving or wayfinding signage?	5	1	5
5	Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)	How well does the project include one or more of the traffic calming features recommended in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians?	5	1	5
6	Parking Improvements (0-5 points)	How well does the project provide appropriate levels of auto access to regional transit and the related project area without detracting from the quality of public spaces, and without detracting from transit, bicycle and pedestrian circulation?	5	1	5
D. Matching Funds					
	Matching Funds (0-15)	The higher the percentage of matching funds, the greater the number of bonus points the project will receive.			15
PROJECT SCORE SUBTOTAL					115
E. Low Income Household Bonus Points³					
TOTAL SCORE					135

Notes

¹Affordable housing is defined as income- or price-controlled housing. See the program guidelines for details.

²All bicycle facility improvements must comply with the requirements of the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000.

³Low income household bonus points awarded per SANDAG Board policy (2/25/05).



Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program (Use-It-Or-Lose-It Policy)

1. **Quarterly Progress Report:** Each project sponsor shall submit a quarterly progress report consisting of the following:
 - a. Accomplishments in the current quarter;
 - b. Anticipated progress next quarter;
 - c. Pending issues and recommended resolutions;
 - d. Current schedule adhering to the two major milestones and nine intermediate milestones; and
 - e. Status of budget, including any updates on project cost estimate.

2. **Milestones and Budget:** SANDAG staff will monitor the budget and all eleven (11) milestones shown below.
 - Start Environmental Studies
 - Draft Environmental Document
 - Final Environmental Document*
 - Obtain Required Permits
 - Begin Design Engineering
 - Complete Plans, Specifications, and Cost Estimates
 - Start Right-of-Way Acquisition
 - Right-of-Way Certification
 - Ready to Advertise
 - Award Construction*
 - Project Completion (project open for use)

*major milestones

3. Project Delays and Extensions up to One Year

- Should any of the intermediate milestones fall behind schedule, the project sponsor shall demonstrate to SANDAG staff that the major milestone schedules will still be met.
- Should any of the major milestones fall behind schedule, the project sponsor can request an extension of up to one year.
- An extension request of up to six months can be approved administratively by SANDAG staff. Requests for extensions of more than six months but less than one year in total shall be determined by the Transportation Committee.
- The project sponsor seeking the extension must demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame.
- If the project sponsor cannot demonstrate that the project can be delivered with the additional time extension, then SANDAG staff shall recommend a fund reallocation to the Transportation Committee in accordance with Section 5 below.

4. Extensions Beyond One Year

Requests totaling more than one year will be considered only for those projects showing extenuating conditions out of the control of the project sponsor, defined as follows:

- **Environmental:** During the environmental review process, the project sponsor discovers heretofore unknown sites (e.g., archeological, endangered species) that require additional investigation and mitigation efforts. The project sponsor must demonstrate that the discovery is new and unforeseen;
- **Permitting:** Difficulty in obtaining permits from various agencies. The project sponsor must demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the necessary permits and that the delay is wholly due to the permitting agency;
- **Construction Schedule:** Applies to projects restricted to certain construction dates during the year (i.e., to avoid nesting season for certain species); and
- **Other:** Changes in federal/state policies or laws

The project sponsor shall appeal directly to the Transportation Committee providing a detailed justification for the requested extension including a revised project schedule. The Transportation Committee shall grant the additional extension only by a vote of two-thirds majority of eligible voting members in attendance.

5. AB 1012 Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements/Fund Reallocation

Each year, Caltrans distributes a memorandum that indicates the amount of TE funds each region must obligate or risk losing the funds. Based on the schedules submitted for each of the funded projects, staff monitors the TE program's obligation commitments for the San Diego region. This policy seeks to ensure project delivery to both meet the State requirements and promote quality projects in the region.

Any reallocation decision should be made with consideration given to the overall TE program's obligation commitment. In the event the project funds are reallocated, staff will recommend to the Transportation Committee to either move the funds to the existing TE reserve account (for TE projects experiencing cost increases) or to notify the next project applicant on the ranking list of the amount of funds available, and request a project schedule and related budget information. If a new project cannot be delivered on a schedule that would avoid a loss of funds to the region, then the funding will be offered to the next project on the priority list. This process will be repeated until a satisfactory project is found.

San Diego
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
MEMO

February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pfeiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant – both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)
2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:
 - a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.
 - b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).
 - c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.

San Diego Association of Governments

JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

April 1, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **F**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW

30006

Introduction

Last year, SANDAG contracted with William Lieberman, AICP, to research bus rapid transit systems around the world to assess their characteristics and applicability to the San Diego experience and environment. Mr. Lieberman conducted a case study review of several cities' bus rapid transit (BRT) systems and evaluated the components that lead to success, the trade-offs among various applications of BRT, and the lessons learned.

Mr. Lieberman will present his research and conclusions at the Joint Meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on April 1.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee are asked to receive this report for information.

BOB LEITER

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Toni Bates, (619) 699-6950, tba@sandag.org

2007 RTP Issue Papers

Brief descriptions of topics to be covered in each issue paper are listed below. They have been grouped into the four major components of mobility from the 2030 MOBILITY RTP. Feedback from a March 15, 2005 meeting with the Stakeholders Working Group has been incorporated.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Independent Transit Planning Review. The reassessment of the MOBILITY 2030 Transit Network would be completed by December 2005. The study involves a consultant and peer review group. At its completion, alternative networks may be recommended for analysis. This work should be done by March 2006 so that the entire transit/highway/arterial networks can be reviewed and go to the Board for inclusion in the draft RTP. In relation to the Independent Transit Review, members of the Stakeholders WG want the evaluation to include an evaluation of how well local service will connect with new regional services.
- Regional Freight Strategy. Staff will coordinate with rail, truck, ship, air, and pipeline infrastructure providers and users to develop a long-range and integrated freight strategy for the region. The individual modal assessment will be completed for the 2006 RTP Update. The intermodal strategy will be completed for the 2007 RTP.
- Regional Arterial System. The definition of a regional arterial and the selection of the Regionally Significant Arterial System should be reviewed and updated for the 2007 RTP. This should be done in context of the future *TransNet* development fee for regional facilities.
- Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria. This task is two-fold. First, SANDAG should develop a process to prioritize regional corridors for future improvements. Second, the existing project evaluation criteria in the RTP should be updated, giving more consideration to transportation projects that are tied to and promote smart growth development. Another category of projects that will have specialized evaluation criteria are Rail Grade Separation projects. The development of this issue paper also should consider whether intermodal projects from the regional freight strategy can be prioritized with other regional projects or should be considered separately. The criteria would be used to develop the networks for the 2007 RTP funding scenarios.
- Regional Airport Ground Access. The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (the "Authority") is conducting the Airport Site Selection Program, evaluating potential new airport sites that could provide sufficient airport capacity to meet the long-range needs of San Diego County residents. At the end of their studies, the Authority is slated to put their site recommendation on a countywide ballot no later than November 2006. Regardless of whether the regional airport moves to a new site or remains at Lindbergh Field, improved ground access is an important issue that directly affects the regional transportation system. While a decision may not be available in time for input and analysis in the 2007 RTP, SANDAG will continue to work closely with the Authority to coordinate this issue.

- HOV/Managed Lanes and General Purpose Lanes. The last RTP was guided by a Board-adopted vision that emphasized the movement of people, not vehicles, and by goals and objectives that focused on mobility. The Board may wish to reaffirm that vision, or revisit the issue of how best to provide additional capacity to the transportation network.

LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION CONNECTION ISSUE PAPERS

- Smart Growth Concept Map. A preliminary Smart Growth Concept Map, which illustrates locations where smart growth land uses are already planned or should be considered by local jurisdictions as they update their general plans, is expected to be completed by June 2005, with a final map to be completed by September 2005. This time frame would give staff the opportunity to create and discuss smart growth land use alternatives for analysis in the 2007 RTP.
- Cross-Border Transportation Issues. Given increasing development across the border in Baja California, this issue paper would assess the transportation impacts of cross-border travel. It would include the impacts of the new East Otay Mesa POE on the location of planned BRT routes and commercial inspection facilities.
- Interregional Transportation Issues. SANDAG staff is currently working with staff of the Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Caltrans on Phase II studies of the I-15 corridor. These studies will include an evaluation of potential for increasing job opportunities in Riverside County, increased housing opportunities in San Diego County, and specific transportation facility and service improvements that should be planned to serve existing and future commuting patterns on the I-15 corridor. The outcomes of these studies would be presented. In addition, this issue paper will address the growing stock of housing in Imperial County and the travel to and from the San Diego region. What impacts does this recent trend have on the regional transportation system?
- Habitat Planning Issues. The new *TransNet*-funded Environmental Mitigation Program is intended to improve the preservation of habitat areas associated with regional transportation projects. How will the new program be implemented related to identified Early-Action *TransNet* Projects and other projects in the 2007 RTP identified for early development?
- Tribal Reservation Development Issues. New development on tribal reservations has caused traffic impacts in rural areas. How can the region better assess the potential impacts on regional facilities from reservation development and plan for the transportation facilities needed to avoid related congestion? The analysis would be done in collaboration with the individual tribes to assess the existing and planned land uses on tribal lands, and incorporate to the greatest degree possible the travel generated from these sources along with the rest of the regional inputs.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Energy Demand and Infrastructure. What types of Transportation Demand Strategies can affect the energy demands of the region for the movement of people and goods? As the cost of energy goes up, how can the region reduce its demand for transportation-related energy

and the resulting pollutants? Can transportation corridors also serve as energy/utility corridors?

SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- Public Safety and Homeland Security. This issue paper will evaluate the impacts of Homeland Security directives on the regional transportation system, as well as looking at issues related to improving safety on the highways and transit system. One issue of public safety brought up at the Stakeholders' WG meeting was developing a regional strategy to deal with planned or unplanned events which shut down a major transportation corridor or facility.
- Toll Facilities. Toll facilities have been considered in other parts of the country and recently in California as a way to provide additional network capacity. The southern portion of State Route 125 was built in this manner. The analysis for the new RTP may want to include an alternative that assesses the impact of new or expanded freeway facilities that are operated as toll facilities.