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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, March 17, 2006

ITEM #

+1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 17, 2006, MEETING MINUTES

+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 5)

+3. PROGRAMMING OF TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS: LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE PROJECT (José A. Nuncio)

The 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) included approximately $6.3 million in new Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds for the San Diego region. At its December 16, 2005, meeting, the Board of Directors placed these TE funds in a reserve, pending future funding recommendations. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors program $2 million from the 2006 STIP TE reserve to the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project.

+4. BIANNUAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REPORT (Chris Kluth)

The report summarizes the results of SANDAG’s efforts to coordinate transit and land use through the project development review process during July to December 2005. SANDAG staff works closely with local jurisdictions to ensure the integration of transit facilities into development projects and to improve the pedestrian environment wherever possible. During the period, these efforts resulted in the inclusion of $3,382,750 worth of privately funded transit and pedestrian facilities.

+5. LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT (Linda Culp)

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. This report summarizes the actions from the LOSSAN Board meeting on February 13, 2006.
REPORTS (6 through 7)

+6. BAYSHORE BIKEWAY PLAN UPDATE (Stephan Vance) APPROVE

The Bayshore Bikeway Working Group has developed a draft plan for completing improvements to the 24-mile Bayshore Bikeway. The plan includes a recommended alignment, cost estimates, and operating and maintenance guidelines for a continuous bike path around San Diego Bay. Estimated cost of the improvements is $9,958,000. The draft plan was distributed in October for public review and comment, and has been modified to reflect input from a broad range of stakeholders around the San Diego Bay. The Bayshore Bikeway Working Group recommends that the Transportation Committee approve the plan.

+7. PRESENTATION ON INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION VEHICLES INFORMATION
(Samuel Johnson)

Vehicle Assist and Automation (VAA) systems are a set of Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies designed to improve the safety and efficiency of transit, private, and commercial vehicles. Staff along with Jake Peters, a representative of private industry, will provide a brief presentation on these intelligent vehicle technologies along with potential benefits and opportunities for the San Diego region.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, April 7, 2006, at 9 a.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 2006

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:02 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 Councilmember Jerome Stocks (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the January 20, 2006, meeting. Xema Jacobsen (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority) and Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) abstained.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, solicited donations for this year’s Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Walk. He asked for support from SANDAG for using the 3,000 acres of the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar on the south side near State Route (SR) 52 for a new international airport location. The future of our Southern California economy is at a crisis point. The region needs this location because the other options are more expensive and less secure. This location would be the best one to serve with added public transportation services and any high-speed rail or maglev services.

Don Stillwell, a member of the public, suggested changes to Routes 13 and 14 that he thought would provide better timed connections for residents of Grantville and for those persons who travel to Kaiser Hospital. He said his suggestions would serve more people in a timely manner and save more operating costs than those suggested in the MTS Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA).

David Krogh, a member of the public, commented positively on the new look and feel of the SANDAG Web site. He also liked the new statistics that are now available. He asked for additional information to be included such as the volume of traffic on Interstate 805 (I-805) in both directions during the morning and evening peak hours. This would provide useful information for the public. He said that it appears traffic in the southernmost section of I-805 has decreased, and he wondered if that was due to increased security measures at the border.
Chair Kellejian welcomed City of San Diego Councilmember Toni Atkins and Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler as new additions to the Transportation Committee.

**CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 6)**

Chair Kellejian stated that Mr. Emery had requested that Consent Item No. 6 be pulled.

3. **FISCAL YEAR 2007 TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)**

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have developed their Capital Improvement Programs for FY 2007, which form the basis for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Area formula fund grant, the Section 5309 Rail Modernization formula fund grant, and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendment for transportation projects. SANDAG is responsible for programming these funds and approving these grants. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend approval of the proposed funding allocations to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

4. **GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FY 2007 TRANSIT OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)**

Pursuant to SB 1703, the Transportation Committee provides guiding principles and objectives for the transit operators for use in preparing their operating budgets. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the proposed guiding principles and objectives for use in preparing the FY 2007 transit operating budgets and the projections for FY 2008 through FY 2011.

5. **TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENT (APPROVE)**

At the June 24, 2005, meeting, SANDAG approved the allocations for the FY 2006 Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provide operating and capital support to transit operators and for nonmotorized projects. Allocations allow for the agencies to claim these funds for specified purposes. The TDA claims for North County Transit District (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) included fund transfers to SANDAG for regional planning and for administrative costs as a result of consolidation. This claim amendment revises the transfer amount for MTS based on the recent Board-approved Addendum to the Master Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD. There is no net change for NCTD. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2006-11 approving the TDA claim amendments for MTS and SANDAG.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Stocks, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 through 5, including Resolution No. 2006-11.
6. TRANSIT REVENUE ESTIMATES AND ALLOCATIONS (RECOMMEND)

Renee Wasmund, Director of Finance, reported that every year SANDAG has the responsibility for providing estimates for regional transit funding under the Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds, and TransNet funds. The FY 2007 estimates are positive and show growth over FY 2006. TDA is apportioned to transit agencies based on population, and the County Auditor provides these statistics. The federal formula funds have historically been apportioned on a 70 (MTS)/30 (NCTD) basis after taking a portion off the top for the regional vanpool and regional planning services. The STA FY 2007 estimates come from the State Controller for the time period of 2008-2011, and the amount is based on the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) fund estimate. Our estimates anticipate that the Proposition 42 transfer will occur and that previously borrowed Proposition 42 funds will be repaid. These monies flow to MTS and NCTD. The TransNet fund monies are split between the old ordinance and the new ordinance. In the original TransNet Ordinance, one-third of the transit funds were split between NCTD and MTS based on population, and that amount was split on an 80/20 (capital/operations) basis. A few years ago, the SANDAG Board approved a change in this formula from 80/20 to 60/40 (capital/operations). The TransNet Extension Ordinance has a funding apportionment. Transit gets 16.5 percent, but it is not defined as a population split; SANDAG assumed that the historical funding split applied. Forty percent of the one-third transit share is 13.3 percent. That is what we have assumed to be available to the transit agencies for operations. The TransNet Extension Ordinance also has a set-aside for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and senior transportation programs. What remains is 2.2 percent. This will be set aside in a regional pool, and the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board will determine how to use this in the region. This amounts to about $6.5 million for this fiscal year.

Mr. Emery reiterated that the transit share of the TransNet Extension is 16.5 percent for operations with subtractions for ADA and senior transportation services. There have been some assumptions made by SANDAG that transit operations are consistent with the current TransNet ordinance. The remaining 2.2 percent of the total revenue available is set aside for discretionary use. This is an assumption we cannot correctly make. Operating capital remains constant. We have an expanded operation now. The voters expected under the TransNet Extension to have an expansion of transit operations. Mr. Emery requested that Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of MTS, go into more detail.

Chair Kellejian reminded Committee members that we are making a decision for money that will not come available until 2009. We’ve been hearing from the transit agencies that they need urgent money for rehabilitation and maintenance. He asked Ms. Wasmund if these dollars can be available for this purpose. Ms. Wasmund responded affirmatively.

Mr. Jablonski said that when the TransNet Extension was being discussed and formulated, there was recognition that transit needed more operating revenue for new services. That is why the percent was increased from 13 percent to 16 percent. The issue of a discretionary pot of money was assumed under last year’s agenda report for this item. The transit operators did not see that assumption. Essentially, the way it is presented, the funding for operations is capped at the existing level consistent with the original TransNet ordinance, and it doesn’t recognize an expanded need. We are addressing this issue now primarily
because of the Mission Valley East (Green Line). We are using federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) dollars to fund that operation at $4.9 million. However, these funds only have a three-year life. In two years, that funding will disappear, and we will be left with a hole in our budget equal to the amount spent for Green Line operations. This increase in operating funds would fill that hole. Our only alternative would be to cut $5 million in current services or take money from the rehabilitation program. We want to maintain a very strict level of growth in terms of expenses. Any additional monies will be placed into the capital plan to cover the $35 million shortfall. Not having this hole filled will drive us considerably backward. Creating this discretionary fund was a policy decision.

Chair Kellejian noted that there were several requests to speak

Gary Fecher, Business Representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), stated that the IBEW represents San Diego Trolley workers and the maintenance side of San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC). In 2004, IBEW assisted with getting the TransNet Extension passed. It is somewhat disconcerting that this Committee is seeking to divert a substantial amount of TransNet Extension money for indeterminate discretionary purposes. On this issue they agree with MTS that a reduction in this share will have deleterious effects on their membership and the transit agencies. They have been working for months to get fair wages and health care benefits, and there is mandatory overtime for workers due to budget constraints. The apprenticeship program with SDTC has been successful, but it is being threatened by budget cuts. The whole amount is needed by the transit agencies and the people who work on a daily basis. He asked that the Transportation Committee not approve the allocations as stated in this agenda item.

Steven Alcove, President, Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1309, Bus Drivers Union, said that the ATU has used every resource it can to help government get funds. They are opposed to the deterioration or siphoning off of the TransNet Extension funds. He supported Mr. Fecher’s request not to approve this item.

Chair Kellejian commented that this issue came up at the Transportation Committee last year, and the SANDAG Board made a decision that this 2.2 percent was to remain flexible and held until 2009 for a decision on its use for the highest and best regional need at that time.

Mr. Mathis explained that CMAQ represents a form of life support as it concerns the operation of the Mission Valley East Line. We have to be able to plan our budgets on revenue sources available. We missed this issue last year and only became aware of it when we saw it this year. We don’t support the action recommended. When it comes to being able to operate the system, it should be up to the transit operators to strike that balance. The recommended action places the transit agencies in a “tin cup” relationship with SANDAG and having to compete for a section of operating funds we feel we are entitled to. We have to have certain sources of revenue in order to be able to plan our budgets. Otherwise, it makes our ability to run our operation more difficult. He felt these funds should be used for operations.

Chair Kellejian said that the legislation was adopted that way during the reorganization of SANDAG. Mr. Mathis didn’t disagree with that but said that the TransNet Extension included
an understanding that there would be an increase in operations. To assume that anything over 13 percent is a surplus is not an appropriate assumption. We need it as a planning tool.

Councilmember Rindone, Vice Chair of MTS, said that on July 8, 2005, the Mission Valley Line was opened. This 5.9-mile extension resulted in new trip miles that would provide a great deal of service. This line has been hailed as a major accomplishment. The CMAQ money is a one-time, three-year source of funding for operations. This rail extension is beyond the original TransNet funding. Voters understood that the TransNet Extension covered expansion of the transit system. This is a known operating gap, and there is no sense creating a known problem. Planning ahead is good fiscal management. The bottom line is that these are operational dollars, and this is not a funding raid from SANDAG. Using this money for operations is keeping a promise to the voters. He urged the Committee to retain this money for operations.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks said that the idea of having a discretionary pot has merit, but operating transit is expensive and a lot of the transit needs are multi-year items. It is not in the best interest of long-term planning to have to come every year and ask SANDAG for money. He supported the comments by MTS representatives.

Chair Kellejian stated that we can earmark it for operations and then at some point in the future determine the highest and best use for those operating dollars.

Councilmember Stocks stated that there is no requirement that all 16 percent of the TransNet funds must go for operations, some can go for capital purposes, and the transit agencies know their needs and should be making the determination for the use of these funds.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) stated that this is exactly why she wanted to be on this Committee. She met with Gary Gallegos because she had concerns about TransNet as it related to transit. Transit users are the voters that typically support revenue enhancement. Her constituents and the public made some assumptions from the TransNet Extension. She lobbied for that sales tax measure based on the fact that there would be an increase in revenue for public transit. The feedback on public transit is that we don’t have a good system and our revenue to operate it is stretched. She felt that we would be reneging on a promise to the public about putting more money towards public transit. We need the certainty of these funds in order to plan for the future.

Chair Kellejian clarified that all of this money will go for transit purposes.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) asked Ms. Wasmund how optimistic we are that the figures for 2009 are pragmatic. Ms. Wasmund responded that the biggest piece of our sales tax revenues is based on our demographic forecasting model. The next biggest piece is the federal formula fund, which is subject to the appropriations process. Based on the STIP, we have reason to believe the Proposition 42 transfer and payback will occur.

Mayor Madrid asked Mr. Jablonski to describe what operations entails. Mr. Jablonski said that operations entails all of the bus services operated internal to MTS, which are San Diego
Transit services, plus all contracted bus services in the South Bay and East County, ADA services, San Diego Trolley operations, and miscellaneous capital projects.

Mayor Madrid asked if the miscellaneous capital projects category could include security cameras. Craig Scott, TransNet Project Manager, stated that in the new TransNet ordinance the operations category has a fairly broad definition. The primary change in the ordinance extension was to provide flexibility.

Mayor Madrid said that La Mesa was one of the first cities to support the trolley. There are five stations in La Mesa. In many cases, those areas have become gangland territory, and the City needs security cameras. We were promised security cameras when the trolley first went in. He wanted the operators to understand that the City of La Mesa is not getting an appropriate response to its request for security cameras. He noted that La Mesa has one of the best smart growth projects in conjunction with transit at Grossmont Center.

Karen King, Executive Director, NCTD, said that what constitutes operations continues to be one of the issues that we struggle with in terms of the authority of the transit agencies versus the authority of SANDAG, and who determines when funding is utilized. There is a thin line between what constitutes operations and what constitutes planning. Marketing and fuel costs also increase. It costs more to maintain the same service levels today. There isn’t sufficient money for all of the needs. We need to get clear as a region the distinction between operations and planning. We also need to ensure flexibility, predictability, and to continue to look at how we can bring more revenue to the region. There also will be a shortfall in funding after the third year of the Sprinter. These were projects in the original TransNet Ordinance that did not have operating funds identified.

Supervisor Roberts said that over the last several years at this Committee and elsewhere, he has talked about the changes of the operating characteristics of transit. As you grow, a larger portion of revenues will be needed for operations. You have to clarify what the problem is. Very predictably, we know that at MTS we are going to have a major shortfall in our operations budget. At the same time, what has happened is that a discretionary fund has been created that would take care of the predictive problems. It is not about security cameras; it’s about the basic service. You won’t need the security cameras if you cannot afford to run the system. We didn’t realize the implications of setting up this discretionary fund last year. This should be part of the operational expense for transit. Discretionary funds only come about when fundamental funding is under control. He apologized that MTS didn’t see the implications of this action last year.

**Motion Made:** Councilmember Emery moved that the policy reflect the full 16.5 percent directed toward operations, that the transit operators have the flexibility to expend these funds rather than SANDAG, and elimination of the 2.2 percent discretionary funds. Councilmember Stock seconded the motion.

Chair Kellejian noted that the 2.5 percent already earmarked for ADA and 3.25 percent for other services needs to be included in the motion. Councilmember Emery agreed.

Councilmember Madaffer asked where we would get the additional funding for things like catenary wire.
Mr. Jablonski said that if we don’t get this source of funding for operations for Mission Valley East when the CMAQ funds dry up, we have two choices: cut $5 million worth of service or continue to defer capital needs. Funding operations with these TransNet monies allows the transit operators to continue to work on the infrastructure issue.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there are other areas, such as legislative efforts, where SANDAG could help the transit agencies obtain funding for maintenance.

Councilmember Stocks clarified that the real issue is that we will be eliminating the 2.2 percent discretionary fund and leaving it in the overall funding for the transit operators. They will decide how to use it for capital, maintenance, or rehabilitation purposes.

Diane Eidam, Chief Deputy Executive Director, stated that the stability of revenue is extremely important, and it is very uncertain at the state level. For the future, there is a focus for funding Proposition 42, primarily in 2009. From her perspective, the new TransNet Ordinance was structured in a way to provide the ultimate flexibility. The 2.2 percent is an element that would provide the SANDAG Transportation Committee the flexibility to address regional needs in 2009. The Mission Valley East line could very well be the highest regional need and that would be the focus of that funding.

Mr. Mathis stated that creating revenue uncertainty will not lend itself to stability. He clarified that the transit operators are already dealing with ADA and senior services. It is important to include that amount with the 16.5 percent. We know what our responsibility is.

Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) said that he is most comfortable with the transit operators making the decision about where this money should be spent.

Chair Kellejian commented that this recommendation would go to the SANDAG Board on February 27.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Emery and a second by Councilmember Stocks, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors, at its February 24, 2006, meeting, adopt the FY 2007 apportionments for various federal, state, and local revenues, with a change in policy for TransNet Extension funds to reflect the full 16.5 percent to be directed toward transit operations, that the transit operators have the flexibility to expend these funds rather than SANDAG, and to eliminate the 2.2 percent discretionary pot of funding; and to approve the revenue projections from FY 2008 to FY 2011 for these revenues.
7. **2030 REVENUE CONSTRAINED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: 2006 UPDATE (RECOMMEND)**

Mike Hix, Senior Planner, reported that on December 9, 2005, staff brought the 2006 update of the revenue constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the Transportation Committee. We will have a full hearing by the Board on February 24. Most of the comments received reflected the understanding that this was a technical update and does not substitute for the more comprehensive effort. This document is needed for air quality conformance requirements. Mr. Hix clarified that this update did not reassess projects but updated the cost estimates and revenue forecasts and included the TransNet program. No comments to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) were notable. He highlighted the public comments. All of the comments will be addressed as part of the comprehensive RTP update in 2007. We have changed the maps in the RTP Update to show the SR 241 toll road from Oceanside south. The estimated revenues in Table 3.1 about financing funding sources have been updated for the last TransNet Plan of Finance for the Early Action Program (EAP). The El Cajon Boulevard Showcase bus rapid transit (BRT) project is being developed in phases with TransNet Transit First priority dollars in 2006-2010. Staff will come back next month with more details. The Final RTP and EIR are ready to be forwarded to the SANDAG Board.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors, at its February 24, 2006, meeting, approve the suggested modifications to the Final 2030 Revenue Constrained Regional Transportation Plan: 2006 Update and the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.

8. **INTERSTATE 5 (I-5) NORTH COAST MANAGED LANES VALUE PRICING PLANNING STUDY: DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN (RECOMMEND)**

Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, provided an overview of this project including a project description, the study overview, a draft Concept Plan, the community outreach program, a summary of report conclusions, and next steps.

Daren Henderson, Senior Supervising Transportation Planner, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. (PBQ&D), discussed the findings of the study including the types of techniques to control demand on managed lanes, access, and pricing. He described the feasibility criteria: demand, access, pricing strategy, impacts to adjacent traffic, technology, revenue, public affairs/acceptance, and equity. He said that there is sufficient demand to justify a managed lane facility. The managed lanes would provide benefit over general purpose lanes and compare to the No Build scenario. Both slip ramps and direct access ramps are needed, and a highly restrictive access concept is best for lane management. He looked at several pricing scenarios including single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) and SOV/HOV-2 (high-occupancy vehicle). He noted that in 2030, some sections of the managed lanes would exceed the capacity level during peak hours with SOV pricing only. The SOV/HOV-2 pricing dramatically reduces the managed lane demand. Pricing strategies evaluated included flat tolls, segment tolls, per mile tolls, and skewed per mile tolls. The recommended pricing
strategy is the skewed per mile. It is best for managing flow and is consistent with the pricing strategy current used on the I-15 managed lanes.

Mr. Henderson said that the revenue forecast varied by the toll strategy selected. The applicable range is $12-$19 million gross annually. The per mile toll and revenues were higher in the southern portion of the study area. The majority of the revenue would be generated south of Manchester. They also looked at various technological and performance monitoring programs. A functional plan was developed for 2015 and 2030. Data collection is key, and we need to communicate the pricing and benefits to the public. He showed an example of signing for the managed lanes that showed pricing and time information. He reviewed the community outreach activities including stakeholder interviews, focus groups, a telephone survey, and an intercept survey.

Mr. Henderson reviewed the results of the public attitudes/acceptance of this program. Most of those surveyed are only I-5 users and use portions of the corridor, they appeared to be favorable to lane management, a simplified pricing was preferred, and equity was important. Under support for the managed lanes, tolls were preferable to limiting access, managed lanes were preferred to general purpose lanes, those polled believed managed lanes can reduce congestion, and these results were consistent across all the demographic groups.

Mr. Henderson reviewed the key findings of the telephone survey, which showed that 62 percent support the construction of the 10+4 lanes, 61 percent feel the project will reduce congestion, and 23 percent felt that it would take too long to implement this project.

The study summary included the following: pricing is feasible for this project, the skewed per mile tolls are best for managing the demand, we may need to consider the region’s HOV policy in the future, the public is favorable to lane management, and we should keep the user information simple.

Ms. Werdick reviewed the next steps, which included the Transportation Committee recommending a preferred pricing strategy and recommending it to the SANDAG Board at its February 24 meeting. These study results will be incorporated into the draft EIR/EIS for the I-5 North Coast study.

Supervisor Roberts asked about the comments regarding the need to reconsider the HOV policy with respect to the number of occupants. What is the time frame when that should be reconsidered? Is that a point at which we will switch to a policy to maintain the pay for service at the expense of the carpools? Ms. Werdick replied that in terms of occupancy on this corridor, there is no need to change in the short term (2015), but we might want to reconsider as we move toward the out years of 2030. In terms of the second question, that is a management policy by the SANDAG Board. The HOV lanes are for carpools and buses. If they fill up, we may have to reconsider increasing the number of passengers that qualify for using these lanes.
Supervisor Roberts said that we should give a defined priority to carpools and buses as opposed to trying to reserve some set level of capacity for SOVs. Ms. Werdick agreed that that is SANDAG’s policy.

Councilmember Druker asked if there would be some type of monitor on a person’s car for a toll. Ms. Werdick said there are transponders for that purpose.

Councilmember Druker stated that access on the I-15 managed lanes is very limited. He asked if there is another part of the country that has similar managed lanes with unlimited access and this type of a transponder. Mr. Henderson responded that there are four other facilities using pricing for demand management: I-15 here in San Diego, in Orange County, in Minnesota, and two in Houston. However, they all have limited access and are physically separated from the general purpose lanes.

Mr. Henderson stated that there are changes in technology that might help regulate the users with different tracking technology.

Councilmember Monroe asked what we are trying to accomplish with the managed lanes. Ms. Werdick replied that it is to provide a mobility choice for each corridor. It provides a reliable travel time for a variety of modes.

Councilmember Monroe said that a lot of those things decrease the number of vehicles. He thought the overriding goal was to increase the capacity of our freeways. There are a number of cities in the county that have managed lanes. He doesn’t feel that we know the benefit of that. He would like to get some of that information from other areas. He had some concern about the comparison with the No Build scenario.

Jack Boda, Director of SANDAG’s Mobility Management and Project Implementation department, said that one of the key objectives for managed lanes is to get as much “through put” as possible. Managed Lanes are the key to moving people. We want to continue to keep the traffic flow moving.

Councilmember Monroe said that there are studies out that suggest if you made all of the lanes general purpose you would achieve more “through put” than with managed lanes. Mr. Boda stated that we are moving more people because of the carpool lanes.

Councilmember Madaffer asked why the managed lanes were selected versus a moveable barrier. Ms. Werdick said that there is a significant directional split in times of day for the I-15 corridor, but not on I-5.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there was a substantial cost difference between moveable barriers and managed lanes. Mr. Henderson said that there is a little cost differential. Operations and maintenance of a moveable facility is more compared to a fixed facility. However, with the demand on I-5 today and in the future, it doesn’t make sense to have moveable barriers in that corridor.

Councilmember Madaffer asked what would need to be done in a situation where the carpool lanes were congested and general purpose lanes were moving freely.
Mr. Henderson said you would need to increase the managed lane occupancy criteria to deal with that issue. When you don’t have the time savings, it takes away the incentive for carpooling. You need to keep in mind that you are providing a mobility option.

Councilmember Madaffer asked a question that was posed to the focus group about the possibility of increasing the fee for the managed lanes. Ms. Werdick replied that the focus group members understood that in order to keep the managed lanes moving an increased fee might be needed.

Councilmember Druker said it was difficult for him to envision how the access points of the managed lanes would work without more detail. He expressed concern that the managed lanes would not be accepted by the public. Chair Kellejian said that the agenda report mentions the access points, and he suggested that Councilmember Druker meet with staff to obtain additional information.

Ms. Werdick noted that there would be five access points.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Stocks, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the “skewed per mile” rate as the preferred pricing strategy for the I-5 North Coast Managed Lanes.

9. **COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICE AGENCY (CTSA) (RECOMMEND)**

Toni Bates, Director of Transportation, summarized this item. She said that the Executive Committee forwarded its recommendation to the Transportation Committee to recommend action to the SANDAG Board. The CTSA is an agency that coordinates specialized transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities among ADA transit and Health and Human Services transportation providers in our county. Prior to consolidation there were two CTSA’s, one appointed by MTDB and one by SANDAG. Following consolidation, SANDAG became responsible for designating a CTSA for the entire county. There is an opportunity to consolidate the CTSA’s into one countywide CTSA due to upcoming contract expirations. In addition, SAFETY-LU provides more requirements and incentives to do more coordination and consolidation through the CTSA. Ms. Bates reviewed the recommendations from the Executive Committee to issue a Request for Proposals for a single countywide CTSA with expanded responsibilities.

Chair Kellejian noted that this action is supported by MTS and NCTD.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Stocks, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the following actions related to the MTS and North County CTSA’s: (1) Combine the MTS and NCTD CTSA service areas into a single regional CTSA service area. This action would transfer the MTS area CTSA from SourcePoint to an outside contractor for the entire region with oversight by the SANDAG Transportation Committee, similar to the oversight currently provided for the North County Lifeline CTSA services; (2) initiate a competitive request for proposals to designate a single regional CTSA to be in place on July 1, 2006 (to coincide with the expiration of the North County Lifeline CTSA services contract), in accordance with
Options A or B in Attachment 3; and (3) ensure that the regional CTSA better meets the spirit and intent of coordination and consolidation of Human and Social Services transportation as envisioned in California statutes and regulations.

10. COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (COA) STATUS (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Dave Schumacher, Principal Planner, reported that over the past year MTS has undertaken a COA to showcase how MTS services will be provided.

Conan Cheung, MTS Director of Planning, described the service development plan. He said the reasons for conducting the COA were to achieve financial sustainability and to reconnect with our markets. There are three tiers of services: urban network services, commuter services, and community-based services. He also explained the service frequency enhancements. He reviewed several examples of the changes being proposed. He noted that there have been some changes from the original plan resulting from community outreach. MTS had to reduce some elements of the original plan, most specifically delaying the community-based services. He stated that there is projected to be an increase of 3.63 million more riders and a $2.14 million increase in revenue. Including operational efficiencies, the annual subsidy savings is about $5 million. He reviewed the public hearing schedule. Staff will be asking the MTS Board to approve this plan on March 9.

Mr. Schumacher reviewed the SANDAG staff comments on the COA Plan: it is consistent with the Smart Growth Map, it provides the early implementation to support the 2030 RTP Transit Plan, and it will be incorporated into the next Regional Short-Range Transit Plan.

Councilmember Monroe noted a correction on the notice for the March 8 public hearing; it should say Wednesday, March 8, rather than Thursday, March 8. Mr. Cheung agreed to make that correction.

Councilmember Druker asked when this plan will be implemented. Mr. Cheung replied that assuming the plan is adopted in March, implementation would begin in June 2006, and it would take about a year of service changes to implement the entire plan.

Councilmember Druker asked about the service to Carmel Valley. Mr. Cheung said that a phasing plan is not in place at this time, but he will report back with that information.

Councilmember Druker encouraged this service in Carmel Valley to be implemented as soon as possible to connect with the NCTD Solana Beach train station.

Councilmember Rindone said that the Transportation Committee sees a dual objective in the COA. There are deeper cuts to provide service in areas currently unserved, and there are certain standards for routes to achieve. He encouraged Transportation Committee members to attend the public hearings.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there will there be a published list of proposed routes to be eliminated. Mr. Cheung replied affirmatively and added that all of the changes for the
individual routes, subregions, and proposed frequency changes will be available at the public hearings, on the Web site, and on the Info Express line (for visually impaired persons).

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

11. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

   The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, March 3, 2006.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 11:06 a.m.
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PROGRAMMING OF TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS:
LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE PROJECT

Introduction

The 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) includes $6.347 million in new Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. At its December 16, 2005, meeting, the Board of Directors placed these funds in a reserve, pending future funding recommendations. This report recommends programming $2 million from the TE reserve to the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project. This funding allocation will fully fund the project, move it forward to construction, and also will preclude the loss of $3 million in state funds from the region. A separate recommendation on the remaining $4.347 million will be made in the near future, pending additional review with various SANDAG advisory working groups. This future recommendation may propose specific funding for projects in the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and/or other TE-eligible projects.

Discussion

The Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project will construct a bridge over Lake Hodges just west of Interstate 15 (I-15) for bikes and pedestrians. It will provide improved connectivity between areas north and south of Lake Hodges. The project is an important link on the I-15 Bikeway identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, connecting Escondido to Poway and Rancho Bernardo. Other than I-15 freeway shoulders, this would be the only San Dieguito River crossing between Bing Crosby Boulevard and State Route 78 (SR 78) at Bandy Canyon Road.

The Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project currently has $3 million programmed in state TE funds that were allocated about five years ago. These state funds are at risk of lapsing unless a contract can be advertised prior to the end of the fiscal year and awarded this summer. An additional $2 million dollars are needed to fully fund this project. The $2 million shortfall is a result of additional design and construction costs due to the lake going from a dry to a wet condition during the above-average rainy season of 2005 as well as higher construction material costs. Unless funding is identified to fully fund this project, its advertisement will be placed on hold, and the state funds will lapse and be lost from the region. This project also has $0.5 million in TransNet Bikeway funds and $1.5 million in State Proposition 13 River Parkway Bond Act funds.

The programming of the $2 million in TE funds also would provide a solution to another programming issue as the region finds itself with the immediate need to allocate TE funds. One of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program projects (the Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors program $2 million in Transportation Enhancement funds for the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project.
The programming action to fund the shortfall on the Lake Hodges project will allow this project of regional significance to move forward to construction. It also will preclude state TE funds from lapsing and being lost from the region. Finally, it will help the region to obligate its FY 2005/2006 TE funds without having them lapse. It should be noted that the Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian Bridge project will still be able to obligate its TE funds in the future unless additional delays require the application of SANDAG’s “Use it or Lose it” policy. (The policy is triggered if a project is 12 months or more behind its original schedule.) Approval of this programming action for the Lake Hodges project does not constitute a schedule extension for the Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian Bridge project.

Upon approval of this recommendation, this item will be taken to the SANDAG Board of Directors for final approval.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, 619-699-1908, jnu@sandag.org
Introduction

The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030, envisions vastly improving regional transit service to make public transit the first choice for many of our trips. To realize this vision, the RTP recognizes that transit improvements need to be integrated into our local communities, and focused in areas with compatible land uses that support an efficient transit system.

The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have had a long history of working with local jurisdictions and other agencies to coordinate land use and transit planning in their service areas. As a result of the agency consolidation, SANDAG is now responsible for these activities. Through existing development review processes, SANDAG staff reviews local development proposals and, where appropriate, recommends improvements to benefit the physical environment for transit. This report provides a list and cost estimates for the transit facilities and accommodations secured through the development review process for the period July 2005 through December 2005. These facilities and accommodations have been implemented at no cost to SANDAG or the transit agencies. The Transit Development Review report is provided to the Transportation Committee on a biannual basis, typically in March and September.

Discussion

SANDAG staff reviewed a total of 358 development projects from local jurisdictions and other agencies in the San Diego region during the second half of calendar year 2005. By submitting comments through each agency’s development review process, we worked with local jurisdictions to incorporate transit facilities and transit-supportive designs into 73 projects which resulted in 337 improvements. The remaining 285 projects reviewed had no direct relationship to the regional transit system due to the nature of the project or because the project was not near any existing or planned transit lines. The types of transit improvements, estimated value, and direct financial benefits secured during the year are summarized in the table below:

### Privately Funded Transit Related Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Improvements</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Value per Item</th>
<th>Direct Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Bus Stops (ADA Compliance)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connections and Accessibility</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bus Stops and Passenger Landings</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Benches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Shelters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$24,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Turnouts/In Street Concrete Pad</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>358</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,382,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,382,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $3,382,750
Financial Benefits

In addition to improving the transit passenger and pedestrian environment, this program results in direct financial benefits. During the period covered by this report, contributions to the regional transit system are estimated at $3,382,750. A detailed list of projects and their associated improvements is provided in Attachment 1.

Bringing existing bus stops up to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, and securing new bus stops and landing pads were among the most common types of improvements with financial benefits. Many of the new bus stops are in newly developing areas where future demand for transit services is anticipated, or in areas that currently do not have adequate bus stops. Without the facilities and accommodations secured through the development review process, the costs for these transit improvements would otherwise be borne by the transit agencies.

Regional Project Distribution

Over the past year, the balance in the number of project improvements has shifted from the central and southern subregions serviced by MTS toward the northern subregion serviced by NCTD. While there could be several reasons for this shift, the fact is that there are fewer opportunities for large scale improvements in the MTS service area where most new development is infill and on a smaller scale. Additionally, the transit infrastructure is older, more established, and more complete in the MTS service area while in the NCTD service area the transit infrastructure is less developed, and there are more opportunities to integrate new or improved facilities into larger scale development projects.

Another significant difference between the two transit service areas is the type of improvements that are requested and the agencies that provide them. NCTD does not have bus shelters with advertising whereas MTS has a contract with Viacom which, in exchange for advertising space on bus shelters, provides the shelter, benches, and trash receptacles.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the role that SANDAG plays in the development review process throughout the region is an effective tool for promoting transit and land use integration. Short-range improvements in bus stops and pedestrian accessibility take place at a scale that improves the transit customer’s experience and helps achieve the regionwide goal of improving regional transit service. Early participation in the review process for large developments ensures that transit will be included as a critical part of the region’s transportation system.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org

Attachment: 1. Development Project Details
# Development Projects Contributing Transit Related Improvements for July - December 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Improved Bus Stops and ADA Compliance</th>
<th>Ped Connection and Accessibility</th>
<th>New Bus Stops and Passenger Landings</th>
<th>New Benches</th>
<th>New Shelters</th>
<th>New Trash Receptacles</th>
<th>Bus Turnouts/ In Street Concrete Pads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlsbad</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Point Lots 5 and 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faraday Spectrum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Airport Hotels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Ranch East Village Master Tentative Map</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Costa Greens-El Camino Real Widening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Research Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Medical Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 76 Melrose to Mission</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowood on Pala Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Road Improvements in Fallbrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Run Ranch in Pauma Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encinitas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2959 Manchester Ave rezone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264 Lake Drive rezone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 La Costa rezone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Encinitas Streetscape Phase 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baquitos Bluffs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escondido</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Ranch Turnout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Proper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Guadalajara Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La terraza Corporate Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCW Townhomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betacourt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Marriott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Valley Ranch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Avenue Townhomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oceanside</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa de Amparo Child Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanpointe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Hope Ranch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Dual Magnet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Condos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Pier Resort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Terrace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace Del Rio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Ranch Plaza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Projects Contributing Transit Related Improvements for July - December 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Improved Bus Stops and ADA Compliance</th>
<th>Ped Connection and Accessibility</th>
<th>New Bus Stops and Passenger Landings</th>
<th>New Benches</th>
<th>New Shelters</th>
<th>New Trash Receptacles</th>
<th>Bus Turnouts/In Street Concrete Pads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey Crossing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Condos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald at Oceanside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station #7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgreens on Lake-Cannon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Center Revision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Hills Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxon St and Country Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Oro Heights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Ridge Townhomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Ranch Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Business Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Planning Area</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camino Del Sur Widening</td>
<td>Black Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Casitas</td>
<td>Otay Mesa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakano</td>
<td>Otay Mesa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Voltaire Mixed Use</td>
<td>Point Loma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Starbucks</td>
<td>Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Diego</td>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Marcos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Station</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Civic Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Vineyards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borden Road Widening</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starling at Rock Springs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vista

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vista Center Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Estates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Way</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Business Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Kidney Dialysis Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Medical Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Projects Contributing Transit Related Improvements for July - December 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Improved Bus Stops and ADA Compliance</th>
<th>Ped Connection and Accessibility</th>
<th>New Bus Stops and Passenger Landings</th>
<th>New Benches</th>
<th>New Shelters</th>
<th>New Trash Receptacles</th>
<th>Bus Turnouts/In Street Concrete Pads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Learning Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Hill Promenade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vineyards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Chapel of Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Learning Center</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Hill Promenade</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Hill</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vineyards</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Chapel of Vista</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                  | $5,000          | $760,000       | $270,000        | $17,000      | $8,000       | $24,750         | $3,382,750        |
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 5

Action Requested: INFORMATION

LOS ANGELES–SAN DIEGO–SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR
AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING REPORT

File Number 3001000

Introduction

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. A LOSSAN membership roster is provided as Attachment 1.

The LOSSAN Joint Powers Board meets quarterly and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meets generally every other month. SANDAG is staff to the LOSSAN Board and TAC through a cooperative funding agreement with the member agencies. A summary of the LOSSAN Board meeting held on February 13, 2006, is provided as Attachment 2.

LOSSAN Board Action Highlights Related to SANDAG Actions

The LOSSAN Board continues to advocate for passenger rail funds that would benefit projects along the coastal rail corridor, including projects along the San Diego coastal rail corridor. Board representatives, along with representatives from the other two state-supported corridors recently met with a number of state legislators to urge that intercity rail projects be included in an anticipated state infrastructure bond proposal. These funds also will benefit the San Diego coastal rail corridor. The LOSSAN Board reviewed and concurred with coastal rail project priorities approved by the SANDAG Transportation Committee at its December 9, 2005, meeting and by the NCTD Board in November 2005. LOSSAN concurrence was requested by Caltrans because a portion of project funds was earmarked to LOSSAN for San Diego rail improvements.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. LOSSAN Membership Roster
               2. February 13, 2006, LOSSAN Board of Directors Actions

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
MEMBERSHIP

This board is composed of current and former elected officials representing rail owners, operators, and planning agencies along Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor between San Diego and San Luis Obispo. LOSSAN is staffed by SANDAG. The objective of the agency is to coordinate planning and programs that increase ridership, revenue, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Luis Obispo to Los Angeles to San Diego.

The Los Angeles - San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency meets every quarter.

Staff contact: Linda Culp
(619) 699-6957; lcu@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Vice Chair: Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit District

Richard Dixon
Orange County Transportation Authority

Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

Keith Millhouse
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Susan Rose
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

John Shoals
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Bill Bronte
Caltrans, Division of Rail

ALTERNATES

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Salud Carbajal
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Mary Ann Reiss
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Jerome Stocks
North County Transit District

Ex Officio Member

Lou Bone
Southern California Association of Governments

Additional Technical Advisory Committee Members

Amtrak

Burlington Northern Santa Fe

California Public Utilities Commission

Southern California Regional Rail Authority

Union Pacific
Board Actions: February 2006

JOINT RAIL AGENCY COORDINATION EFFORTS

The Board of Directors discussed meetings with key legislators held in Sacramento on January 26 by LOSSAN, the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA), the San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee (SJVRC), and Amtrak. The purpose was to focus attention on passenger rail and the importance of including rail improvements in the current infrastructure bond proposals. A fact sheet was developed for these meetings. Amtrak CEO David Hughes attended, as well as board members from LOSSAN, CCJPA, and SJVRC. A noon-time reception also was very well attended. The Board recommended that these joint visits be a regular occurrence.

STATUS OF STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BONDS AND FUNDING FOR LOSSAN CORRIDOR PROJECTS

Caltrans provided an update on recent activities related to a 2006 infrastructure bond measure and discussed the inclusion of $500 million for intercity passenger rail improvements in the Governor’s recent bond proposal. The Board discussed efforts by LOSSAN, the CCJPA, and SJVRC to develop an infrastructure bond proposal to focus on these main themes:

- Establish an intercity rail improvement account
- Promote the ability of rail agencies to spend over the short-term
- Allocations should follow a known process (e.g., Proposition 116)
- Capital invested in private rights-of-way should require a public benefit
- Funding for grade separations, sealed corridors, and crossings should be a separate funding source

The Board recommended that this proposal be transmitted to key legislators as soon as possible.

Caltrans also discussed the recent straw proposal announced for the 2006 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The $39 million proposal includes a number of LOSSAN priority projects such as the Los Angeles County triple track and grade separations, Fullerton Station Parking Structure, Solana Beach Parking Structure, replacement rail in Ventura County, and capitalized maintenance.

In response to a concern by SLOCOG that two rail projects included in their regional priorities did not make the ITIP proposal, the LOSSAN Board directed staff to write to the State and request they be added.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND THE LOSSAN CORRIDOR DEFINITION

Amtrak staff discussed the recent proposal by the Bush Administration to provide $900 million for Amtrak in FY 2007, below the FY 2006 level of $1.3 billion set by Congress, but above the zero budget proposal of the Administration a year ago. Also disturbing in this $900 million proposal is zero funds for Amtrak operations. The Board directed staff to contact the federal delegation to urge its support to fully fund Amtrak and create a stable, multi-year funding program.
Amtrak staff also provided an update on federal legislative efforts. Unfortunately, the House Ways and Means Committee recently stripped the funding proposal from the Rail Infrastructure Development and Expansion Act (RIDE-21) that would have financed rail improvements. There has been no change to S. 1516, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act (PRIIA), sponsored by Senators Lott and Lautenberg and others to provide a federal matching program for rail capital.

Staff provided an update on the LOSSAN corridor definition, an effort to correct the definition in federal legislation from its current identification of Del Mar to San Diego, which is a small portion of the 351-mile corridor. Metrolink staff is currently working to identify members on the House side to sponsor this change in the technical corrections bill to the surface transportation bill (SAFETEA-LU). The Board also directed staff to prepare a letter for signature from as many corridor delegates as possible on this issue.

LOSSAN APPROVAL FOR SAN DIEGO RAIL CAPITAL PROJECT PRIORITIES

Late last year, Caltrans requested that NCTD and SANDAG weigh in on prioritizing major capital projects along the rail corridor in San Diego County, in preparation of $66 million in state funding, a portion of which are reprogrammed funds. Both agencies have provided these priorities to Caltrans and since a portion of available funds is Proposition 116 funds earmarked for LOSSAN in these projects, Caltrans also requested that SANDAG and NCTD seek concurrence from LOSSAN. The Board agreed with these priorities and the reprogramming of Proposition 116 funds.

LOSSAN CORRIDORWIDE STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN STATUS REPORT

The Board received a status report on the LOSSAN Corridorwide Strategic Business Plan including an assessment of commuter rail between Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties and a detailed rail modeling analysis. Modeling analysis will focus on three core alternatives – Amtrak operating this commuter service, Metrolink operating this service, or a more Coaster-like commuter operation. Amtrak provided a forecast of ridership for additional morning and afternoon peak-period trips, and the IBI Group, project consultants, has analyzed the projected ridership for the Metrolink and Coaster-like scenarios. The Board urged staff to devote a large portion of its next meeting to these issues and modeling results and encouraged Board members from the northern agencies to attend. Results and a draft plan are expected by the Board’s next meeting in May.

PACIFIC SURFLINER REPORT

Pacific Surfliner trains experienced record ridership in January with a 30 percent increase over January 2005, when winter storms severely impacted service. On-time performance was at 76 percent for December, well below the goal of 85 percent for the corridor. Delays continue to be primarily due to interference with other passenger and freight trains.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The Board of Directors will next meet on Wednesday, May 10, 2006, in San Diego. This meeting will begin at 11:30 a.m.

The next LOSSAN TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 21, 2006, at 11:30 a.m. in Los Angeles.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None received.
BAYSHORE BIKEWAY PLAN UPDATE

Introduction

Over the past year, the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group has been working to develop an updated plan for the Bayshore Bikeway. The purpose of this effort is to take a fresh look at opportunities to improve the bikeway that may not have existed when the original plan was developed in 1976. Another objective is to ensure that future bayfront development accommodates the bikeway. The plan includes a recommended alignment, cost estimates, and operating and maintenance guidelines for a continuous bike path around San Diego Bay from downtown San Diego to Coronado. The draft plan has been available for review since last October and has been modified to reflect input from a broad range of stakeholders around San Diego Bay. The estimated cost of the proposed improvements is $9,958,000.

It has been determined that this project is statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section 15262, which does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration for projects involving only feasibility or planning studies.

Discussion

Background

The Bayshore Bikeway is a 24-mile bicycle route that connects the five jurisdictions around the San Diego Bay. The route currently includes 12 miles of Class 1 bike path, which is a bikeway constructed in right-of-way separate from the roadway. The rest of the bikeway consists of either Class 2 bike lanes striped on the edge of the roadway, or Class 3 bike routes, which are recommended routes designated only by signage on existing streets. The bikeway loop is closed at its northern end by the ferry between Coronado and downtown San Diego. Attachment 1 is a map of the Bayshore Bikeway.

The 1976 Bay Route Bikeway Planning Study (as it was known then) led to a number of improvements along the route. The most notable of these was the bike path on the western side of the Bay in the City of Coronado. After an initial series of projects were completed, work on the bikeway stalled until the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group was formed in 1990. This working group consists of an elected representative from the County and each of the cities around the Bay and a representative from the Board of Port Commissioners. Current members include County Supervisor Greg Cox who is the chair; Coronado Councilmember Phil Monroe; Imperial Beach Mayor Pro Tem Fred McLean; Chula Vista Deputy Mayor John McCann; National City Councilmember Rosalie Zarate; and San Diego Councilmember Kevin Faulconer; and Commissioner Bill Hall from the San Diego Association of Governments.

Recommendation

The Bayshore Bikeway Working Group recommends that the Transportation Committee approve the updated Bayshore Bikeway Plan.
The Bayshore Bikeway provides a unique opportunity for the San Diego region. Because the bayfront is an employment center, the bikeway serves as a commuter facility connecting bicyclists to the Navy bases, National Steel and Shipbuilding Company, and other employers along the working waterfront. Additionally, the bikeway is an attractive destination for recreational bike riders, skaters, birdwatchers, and strollers. Like the Bay itself, the bikeway has a scenic side, and an industrial side, and so it must serve the needs of a variety of users. This plan addresses the needs of all these user groups.

The Plan

The Working Group established two primary goals for the plan. First, the plan should identify an alignment for a continuous Class 1 bike path around the Bay for as much of the route as possible. Second, once the alignment is determined, the plan should establish how the bikeway could be implemented within the context of existing local plans, and to ensure those plans make provisions for the needed bikeway improvements.

The Bayshore Bikeway passes through five jurisdictions and Port tidelands, and the proposed alignment for the bikeway will require the cooperation of several large employers and/or land owners in the South Bay. As such, public outreach and involvement of key stakeholders were an important part of the plan development process. Staff, the consultant team, and members of the Working Group made direct contact with a wide range of stakeholders as shown in the table below. In addition, two workshops on the plan recommendations were held, one at SANDAG for local agency staff, and one in National City that sought input from the general public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Consulted in the Plan Development Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre City Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Steel and Shipbuilding Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Electric Railway Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan that emerged from this process focuses on the east side of the Bay where the route is mostly on local streets. Workday traffic volumes in National City and San Diego can be very high through this section with significant truck traffic. This is where the route is most constrained, but where improvements are most needed. Despite these constraints, the plan identifies an alignment for a bike path that meets the objectives set for it by the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group.

Beginning in downtown San Diego, the recommended improvements close a gap in the existing bikeway by creating a better link between the ferry landing at the Broadway Pier and the bayside Convention Center promenade. This improvement will be made possible by the cooperation of the Port District as it develops the North Embarcadero Vision Plan, the Old Police Headquarters...
redevelopment, and the park at Deadmen’s Point. Through the Convention Center, the bikeway will serve the hotels and the ballpark, with a portion of the new alignment created in conjunction with new hotel development.

South of the Convention Center is the section of the bikeway that presents the greatest challenges, but this is also where the plan’s recommendations could bring the most significant improvements. Once implemented, the plan will make bicycling a more realistic commute option for waterfront employees. It will improve bicycle and pedestrian access to the light rail transit stations along Harbor Drive, and it will increase recreational opportunities for the residential communities to the east. Implementation will require the cooperation of the Navy, the Port District, and area employers. In particular, the bike path will have to be coordinated with plans for marine terminal access improvements along Harbor Drive to Interstate 15. Undergrounding of utilities and better utilization of available parking areas also will be required to make room for the bike path.

Most of the recommended alignment in National City is through industrial areas, but National City sees opportunities for redevelopment around the historic railroad station that could enable a more direct alignment to the existing bike path at Pepper Park and the future National City marina. This is where the bikeway returns to the bayfront and crosses into Chula Vista on the new Gordy Shields Bridge.

Once in Chula Vista, the right-of-way becomes much less constrained. The City of Chula Vista has already begun planning to extend the existing bike path from E Street to Lagoon Drive. South of Lagoon Drive, Chula Vista and the Port District are working together on a bayfront master plan that envisions a mix of uses including open space, office, residential, retail, civic, visitor, and marina-related. The Bayshore Bikeway would be an excellent complement to this planned development serving both commuter and recreational users. The bike path improvements could be constructed as the area redevelops.

South of J Street, the recommended alignment for the path parallels the old Coronado Branch Line owned by the Metropolitan Transit System. At Main Street it would connect to the bike path currently being developed by the City of San Diego. This project will be built on existing dikes through the salt evaporation ponds and will connect to the existing bike path along the Imperial Beach bayfront. It is scheduled for construction in early 2007, and because funding already has been programmed, it is not included in the plan’s cost estimate.

The City of Imperial Beach completed its section of the Bayshore Bikeway when it constructed approximately one mile of bike path along its bayfront in 1996. However, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has proposed development of a pedestrian boardwalk between 10th and 7th Streets in conjunction with the development of the South San Diego Bay wildlife refuge. In addition, Imperial Beach has plans to improve the connection between the Bayshore Bikeway and its beach area by constructing a bike path spur starting where the Bayshore Bikeway enters Imperial Beach.

The only portion of the Bayshore Bikeway within the City of Coronado that is not already a Class 1 bike path is the section along Glorietta Boulevard from Pomona Avenue to Fifth Street. This is a wide, low volume street, with no significant history of problems associated with the bikeway. No new improvements are planned at this time.
Cost

The estimated cost of the improvements recommended in this plan is $9,958,000. Attachment 2 provides an itemized cost summary. While the plan does not include a financing plan, there are a variety of ways to finance the improvements. Portions of the bikeway are in areas that are redeveloping, so local jurisdictions could require bikeway improvements to be constructed by developers in conjunction with that redevelopment. The undergrounding of utilities could be covered through local utilities undergrounding programs. In addition, the Bayshore Bikeway is a part of the state Coastal Trail that is being developed by the Coastal Conservancy and State Coastal Commission. The Coastal Trail has been funded through state bonds, and some of that funding could be used to improve the Bayshore Bikeway. Finally, SANDAG has provided funding for a number of regionally significant bikeway projects like the Bayshore Bikeway and the Coastal Rail Trail (in the North County Coastal subregion) using local bikeway funds (TransNet and Transportation Development Act) and federal funding from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program or other federal programs.

The plan divides the bikeway into 10 segments and provides cost estimates for each segment. As long as the segments are constructed in a logical order, it should be possible to add sections of bike path to the bikeway incrementally, thus spreading the cost out over time.

Next Steps

With the Transportation Committee's approval of this plan, the Bayshore Bikeway Working Group will begin developing an implementation strategy. This strategy would include a recommendation for how to prioritize improvements as funding becomes available. The Working Group also will continue to work with local jurisdictions and the Port District to ensure this plan gets incorporated into their plans for the Bay. Finally, the Working Group will try to identify funding opportunities to accelerate implementation of the plan.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Bayshore Bikeway Map
               2. Bayshore Bikeway Plan Probable Costs
               3. Bayshore Bikeway Plan [PDF]

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

BAYSHORE BIKEWAY

San Diego Bay
National City
Chula Vista
Imperial Beach

BIKE PATH
ON-STREET LANE/ROUTE
CURRENT PROJECTS

Ferry
Coronado
Embarcadero
Harbor Drive
Main Street
Sweetwater Channel
Hoover St.
C St.
E Street
F Street
Main Street
SD&AE Railroad R/W
Coronado Landing
Market Street
National City Blvd.
Civic Center Dr.
National City Marina
32nd St.
5th Avenue
Broadway
Tidelands Ave.
Chula Vista Marina
Silver Strand State Beach
Stella Ave.
Marina Parkway
Bay Blvd.
Saturn Blvd.
Palomar Street
Palm Ave.
Orange Ave.
Glorietta Blvd.
J Street
San Diego
Coronado
National City
Imperial Beach
Chula Vista

February 2005
## Bayshore Bikeway Plan Update
### Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost

#### Summary
Length: 10 miles of new alignment (26 miles total)  
Location: San Diego Bay  
Calculated By: DJB  
Checked By: SV  
Date: 2/24/06  
Job No. 17522.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Items</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove Pavement</td>
<td>4433 SY</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Excavation</td>
<td>15794 CY</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$315,888.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate Street Light</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>5500 FT</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Bikeway</td>
<td>7402 TN</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$370,087.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Base</td>
<td>7722 CY</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$308,888.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain</td>
<td>4500 FT</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>8300 FT</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$166,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct Chain Link Fence</td>
<td>1000 FT</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Striping / Pavement Markers</td>
<td>37700 FT</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Striping</td>
<td>63800 FT</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Buffer</td>
<td>167950 SF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$167,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Visibility Crosswalk (1 per int.)</td>
<td>28 EA</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Countdown Signals (2 per int.)</td>
<td>52 EA</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Warning/Advisory (4 per int.)</td>
<td>112 EA</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantilever Bridge</td>
<td>10600 SF</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,325,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefabricated Bridge across creek</td>
<td>5820 SF</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,164,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall</td>
<td>8000 SF</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Overhead Utilities</td>
<td>5750 LF</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$862,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $5,846,741.94  
Const Contingency 25% $1,461,685.49  
Subtotal Construction $7,308,427.43

### General Construction Items
- Mobilization 3% of Construction $219,252.82  
- Clearing and Grubbing 2% of Construction $146,168.55  
- Water Pollution Prevention 2% of Construction $146,168.55  
- Traffic Control 2% of Construction $146,168.55

TOTAL Construction $7,966,186

### Project Costs
- Engineering 15% of Total Construction $1,194,927.88  
- Environmental 10% of Total Construction $796,618.59

Total Project Cost $9,958,000

**Notes:**
1. Costs do NOT include the following:
   - Property Take Purchases
   - Environmental Mitigation Costs
   - Drainage Improvements
2. This Cost Opinion is for planning purposes only. A more detailed opinion will be required at Design stage.
3. Costs are good for year 2005 only.
4. Cantilever bridge on harbor assumes the existing bridge can support new cantilever bridge.
PRESENTATION ON INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION VEHICLES

Introduction

Vehicle Assist and Automation (VAA) systems are a set of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies designed to improve the safety and efficiency of transit, private, and commercial vehicles. Staff will introduce Jake Peters, a representative of private industry, who will provide a brief presentation on the potential benefits and opportunities of applying these technologies for the San Diego region.

Discussion

Intelligent Transportation Systems and their components play an increasingly important role in our ability to manage our transportation system. The SANDAG ITS program is focused on improving safety and maximizing the efficiency of our transportation systems. A key aspect of the ITS Program is to inform policymakers of the benefits and opportunities these technologies provide. As part of this effort, Mr. Peters will provide a presentation on VAA systems.

VAA systems are aimed at improving the efficiency and operation of private, transit, and commercial vehicles. The core applications of VAA include:

- Precision Docking
- Vehicle Guidance
- Platooning
- Automatic Vehicle Operations

The presentation will focus on a subset of these applications and identify opportunities for operational deployments. Staff is researching VAA technologies and prospective grants to provide information to the Transportation Committee for discussion of their benefits and to receive direction on pursuing demonstration deployments.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Samuel Johnson, (619) 699-6958, sjo@sandag.org
# Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Funding Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Avenue Mobility Project-Phase I</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Improvements along University Avenue transit corridor in North Park: University Ave. from Florida St. to Boundary St., Lincoln Ave. from Utah St. to 32nd St., and North Park Way from 30th St. to 32nd St. landscaped/painted medians, restripe University Ave., pedestrian popouts, new traffic signals, enhanced pedestrian crossings w/in-pavement flashers, pedestrian countdown signal heads, relocation of parking to side streets, new bike racks, enhanced North Park street name signs. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project serves a major transit corridor with the region’s most frequent bus service where 286 housing units are under development, including the City of Villages North Park Theater Pilot Project. The community plan encourages mixed use development with residential densities of at least 75 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a pedestrian bridge to serve as a grade-separated pedestrian crossing of Harbor Drive. <strong>Setting:</strong> The project area includes downtown San Diego’s East Village Ballpark District where anticipated adjacent development will include residential towers with up to 1,500 dwelling units and 300,000 square feet of retail space.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3   | Grossmont Trolley Station Pedestrian Enhancements | City of La Mesa/Metropolitan Transit System | **Project:** Grossmont Trolley station pedestrian improvements including a tower with 2 elevators and stairs to a bridge that will enable pedestrians/transit users to access employment and entertainment centers at the top of the hill.  
**Setting:** This is a developing urban center at a major suburban light rail hub with primarily retail and medical uses, and planned residential development under a joint-use agreement with MTS. Station area development will include 527 residential units. | 103   | $4,700,000        | $2,000,000      | $2,000,000      | 2008                  |
| 4   | Washington/Goldfinch Intersection Pedestrian Improvement Project | City of San Diego                      | **Project:** Pedestrian popouts, enhanced crosswalks/sidewalks, lighted bollards, trees, shrubs, ground cover, transit shelter, bike racks, enhanced paving in the median, upgraded traffic signals on all four corners.  
**Setting:** A community center with recent mixed-use development, this project will serve the Paseo de Mission Hills, which will provide 69 housing units, ground-floor retail, and a variety of public improvements that will be coordinated with the intersection improvements. | 102   | $928,000          | $684,000        | $684,000        | December 2006          |
| 5   | Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan           | City of San Diego                      | **Project:** Improvements in the Bird Rock neighborhood including five modern roundabouts, a raised landscaped median, diagonal parking, new pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, and transit facility and pedestrian improvements.  
**Setting:** Bird Rock is a community center served by two bus lines where current development projects should increase densities to 25-30 units per acre. 139 condominium units are being constructed along the project. | 100   | $4,385,000        | $2,000,000      | $2,000,000      | September 2006          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6   | Palomar Gateway Community Transit Area Project    | City of Chula Vista     | **Project:** Street improvements along Palomar St. and Industrial Blvd., improvements to the Palomar Transit Station and its environs.  
**Setting:** This community center is at the Blue Line’s Palomar Street Trolley Station with bus service as high as 10 buses per hour. The Chula Vista General Plan update will allow low- to mid-rise residential development between 18-50 dwelling units per acre. Planned mixed-use development at the project area will provide 316 additional housing units. | 96    | $2,375,000        | $2,000,000      | $2,000,000      | January 2007          |
| 7   | Fountain Plaza-Promenade                         | City of National City   | **Project:** Construction of a central square for outdoor markets and fairs, including installation of a fountain, streetlights, landscaping, benches, and bicycle facilities, in downtown National City.  
**Setting:** This project is in the National City Town Center where the “form-based” Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within 1/4-mile of a Blue Line trolley station. | 95    | $516,000          | $258,000        | $258,000        | August 2006           |
| 8   | Allison Avenue-University Avenue Pedestrian Enhancements | City of La Mesa         | **Project:** Improvements to the pedestrian environment along Allison and University Aves. within downtown La Mesa, including upgraded sidewalks, crosswalks, street trees, lighting, and transit stop improvements.  
**Setting:** This project is at the hub of the La Mesa town center, served by an Orange Line trolley station. It is also along a transit corridor. Current residential development ranges up to 50 dwelling units per acre. Planned development will intensify and increase the mix of uses in the area. | 94    | $3,156,000        | $1,994,000      | $1,994,000      | September 2007         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9   | Mid-City Urban Trail & SR 15 Bikeway             | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Pedestrian and bicycle right-of-way improvements along the I-15 corridor in Mid-City San Diego, including widened pedestrian paths, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, wayfinding and bikeway signage, bikeway striping, and signal improvements.  
**Setting:** This Mid-City town center is also served by a major transit corridor, and includes the City of Villages Boulevard Marketplace Pilot Village. The trail system will serve 386 planned residential units. | 94    | $2,966,000        | $1,600,000      | $1,600,000         | December 2009     |
| 10  | Commercial Street Streetscape Project            | City of San Diego       | **Project:** New sidewalks, curbs, street trees, lighting, street furniture, traffic calming devices, a gateway element, and public plazas around the perimeter of a proposed mixed-use/mixed-income development in Logan Heights.  
**Setting:** This community center is focused around the Commercial Street Orange Line trolley station. The project will serve a mixed-use development with 39,300 square feet of commercial space and 263 housing units (68 units per acre) that are primarily affordable rental units. | 91    | $1,800,000        | $1,500,000      | $1,500,000         | June 2009           |
| 11  | National City Boulevard Sidewalk and Street Lighting Improvement Project | City of National City   | **Project:** Rehabilitation of a 6½ block area of National City Blvd., including replacement of sidewalks, installation of decorative streetlights, trees, tree grates, shrubbery, and bus benches.  
**Setting:** This project is in the National City Town Center where the "form-based" Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within ¼-mile of a Blue Line trolley station. | 90    | $3,280,000        | $2,000,000      | $1,022,000         | October 2006         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12  | Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project  | City of Imperial Beach  | **Project:** Pedestrian-oriented enhancements including widened/upgraded sidewalks and crosswalks, improved landscaping, street furnishing and signage, traffic calming features in a 2-3 block area along Palm Ave. between Seacoast Dr. and 3rd St.  
**Setting:** Old Palm Avenue is a community center that combines residential, commercial and retail uses, and is served by three bus routes. Allowable residential density is up to 29 dwelling units per acre. Ten residential units were recently constructed, and there is capacity for an additional 108. | 86    | $2,000,000       | $1,000,000       | $685,000       | December 2006    |
| 13  | National City Boulevard Median and Landscape Improvement Project | City of National City  | **Project:** Installation of medians and landscaping on National City Blvd. from 7th St. to Division St. to improve traffic safety and the visual appeal of the street.  
**Setting:** This project is in the National City Town Center where the "form-based" Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within ¼-mile of a Blue Line trolley station. | 86    | $1,440,000       | $720,000        | $720,000       | October 2006      |
| 14  | Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza Project            | City of Escondido       | **Project:** Reconstruction of a two-lane through street into a short two-lane cul-de-sac ending in a large pedestrian plaza.  
**Setting:** This project is in Escondido's town center, which is the traditional retail core area and the site of significant civic and cultural facilities. High-frequency local transit service connects to the future Sprinter Station at the Escondido Transit Center ½-mile away. 142 proposed condominium units would be served by the project. | 86    | $1,100,000       | $945,000        | $647,000       | July 2008         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15  | 25th Street Renaissance Project                | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Revitalization of a six-block area of 25th St. north of I-94, including pedestrian amenities, traffic calming, streetscape improvements, and parking.  
**Setting:** 25th St. is planned as a community center for Golden Hill. It is primarily a commercial area currently served by three bus routes. The surrounding community is largely residential at an average of 29 dwelling units per acre. | 85    | $1,589,000          | $1,425,000       | -                 | December 2009         |
| 16  | Grand Avenue / El Mercado Project             | City of Escondido       | **Project:** Pedestrian lighting on Grand Ave. through the downtown area, reconstruction of Grand Ave. from Centre City to Quince in the Mercado area to include decorative paving and sidewalks.  
**Setting:** El Mercado is within the Escondido town center. Grand Avenue is served by three routes with 15-minute service to the Escondido Transit Center. Residential densities up to 45 dwelling units per acre are allowed. | 85    | $1,600,000          | $1,320,000       | -                 | July 2008             |
| 17  | Reo Drive Revitalization Project-Phase II Improvements | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Rehabilitation of a one-block commercial strip including widening Reo Dr. for installation of enhanced crosswalks, bus pads, diagonal parking, pedestrian-oriented street lights, new sidewalks, enhanced landscaping and shade trees, ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps and curb enhancements.  
**Setting:** This Skyline-Paradise Hills community has begun a revitalization process aimed at creating a commercially-oriented community center. It is served by two local bus routes. Allowable residential densities are up to 15 dwelling units per acre. | 84    | $939,563            | $447,282         | -                 | June 2007             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H Street Transit Corridor Project</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Beautification and improvements to pedestrian facilities along H St. between 3rd Ave. and Broadway.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>San Ysidro Pilot Village Corridor Project</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Transportation and streetscape improvements including bicycle lanes, sidewalk widening, pedestrian ramps, popouts, trees, street furniture, median landscape, and other improvements.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$2,268,851</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail (Oceanside-to-Escondido ) Project-Phase II</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a one-mile segment of the Oceanside to Escondido Rail Trail bicycle path, in San Marcos.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rose Creek Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> A 280-foot-long pedestrian and bicycle bridge across Rose Creek in Mission Bay Park, and pedestrian and Class I bicycle trails leading to the bridge.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22  | Balboa Avenue Corridor Improvements Project- Phase I | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Traffic calming features and raised and landscaped medians, addition of two signalized intersections, reconfiguration of Balboa Ave., and other improvements.  
**Setting:** The project connects two proposed community centers that currently consist of auto-oriented retail development and a mixture of single- and multi-family residential development. | 76    | $6,000,000         | $2,000,000       | -               | December 2007     |
| 23  | Streetscape II Project                           | City of Encinitas        | **Project:** Improvements to Hwy 101 between F St. and the entrance to Swami’s Beach Park, including curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements, landscaped corner safe crossings, street furniture and lighting, increased parking.  
**Setting:** This streetscape project lies within the downtown Encinitas community center. The project area includes the Lumberyard Shopping Center, and is near the Encinitas Civic Center and Encinitas Transit Station. Planned residential density will reach 20 to 25 units in the surrounding area. | 74    | $3,105,000         | $300,000        | -               | April 2006        |
| 24  | Solana Beach Mixed Use Development               | North County Transit District | **Project:** Lighted walkways, improved signage, additional benches and sidewalks, covered pedestrian path from parking structure to platform, specialized bike facilities, doubling of drop-off zones, and dedicated bus parking space for NCTD Route 308.  
**Setting:** The Solana Beach Train Station project is a mixed-use development that will serve the LOSSAN rail corridor and two bus routes. The project includes 141 residential rental units, live/work units, retail, and office space, with three underground parking structures. Residential density will increase from 0 to 52 units per acre. | 73    | $3,400,000         | $2,000,000       | -               | June 2009         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25  | San Luis Rey Transit Center at North River Village | North County Transit District | **Project:** Construction of transit center and public improvements such as sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian and bike facilities.  
**Setting:** North River Village is planned as a mixed-use development that includes the proposed San Luis Rey Transit Center, 133 townhomes, and 13,684 square feet of retail and office space. | 70    | $6,000,000          | $2,000,000       | -                | September 2007     |
| 26  | Coastal Rail Trail Project                       | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Construction of a 20-mile-long portion of the Coastal Rail Trail bicycle facility between Del Mar and downtown San Diego.  
**Setting:** This is part of a larger multi-jurisdictional bikeway project along the coast in the cities of Oceanside, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Carlsbad, Del Mar, and San Diego. This portion of the trail will serve the Sorrento Valley Coaster. | 61    | $1,712,900          | $1,000,000       | -                | August 2010        |
| 27  | San Diego River Bike Path Linkages               | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Rio Courtyard/River Run bike path linkage - construction of a bridge over a drainage channel to link bike path segments in Mission Valley.  
**Setting:** This is part of a larger project in Mission Valley that will link gaps in an existing regional bikeway. One of the linkages will link the Rio Vista and Fenton Marketplace trolley stations. | 61    | $1,402,000          | $371,000        | -                | August 2007        |
| 28  | Alvarado Canyon Road Realignment Project         | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Realignment of Alvarado Canyon Road to improve bike, pedestrian, bus, and trolley access in and around Grantville.  
**Setting:** This project will serve the recently constructed Grantville Trolley Station and the Grantville Redevelopment Area, which anticipates residential densities of up to 20 units per acre near the new trolley station. | 58    | $6,300,000          | $2,000,000       | -                | December 2009      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 29  | SR 75/282 Toll Removal Mitigation Measure Project | City of Coronado       | **Project:** A metering system for traffic entering Coronado from the bridge, traffic signals, sidewalk bulbouts, and enhanced landscaping along the corridor.  
**Setting:** This project results from the removal of the toll on the San Diego-Coronado Bridge in 2002. The project area is served by four bus routes. Negotiations are underway for development of 30 high-density, low-income senior housing units within two blocks of the project area. | 57    | $2,800,000        | $700,000        | -               | 2009                   |
| 30  | City of Santee Bike Path/ Walkway                | City of Santee          | **Project:** Construction of a bike path, sidewalk, and landscaping within the Cuyamaca St. right-of-way.  
**Setting:** This project will serve planned mixed-use developments specified in Santee's Town Center Specific Plan, including an entertainment complex, office buildings, and multi-family housing. Planned residential density will reach 30 units per acre on specific sites. The project will be located within ¼-mile of the MTS Transit Station. | 55    | $2,233,800        | $1,000,000      | -               | September 2007          |
| 31  | Sweetwater Springs Boulevard Sidewalks           | County of San Diego     | **Project:** Construction of sidewalks and installation of street lighting along portions of Sweetwater Springs Blvd. in Spring Valley.  
**Setting:** This community center includes residential and commercial uses, and two schools. The project is served by one bus route. | 53    | $935,000          | $390,000        | -               | December 2005          |
| 32  | Stage Coach Lane Sidewalks at Fallbrook High School | County of San Diego     | **Project:** Construction of a curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the south side of South Stage Coach Lane in front of Fallbrook High School.  
**Setting:** This project will directly serve Fallbrook High School, and the Fallbrook Smart Growth Opportunity Area, a rural community within an unincorporated area of the county. The project is served by a nearby bus route. | 39    | $1,400,000        | $700,000        | -               | June 2006              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>FundsRequested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Santee Trolley Square Raised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> A raised pedestrian crossing between the MTS Transit Center in Santee Trolley Square and a future mixed-use development site. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project will be located in Santee’s town center, adjacent to the MTS transit station located in Santee Trolley Square. Planned residential density will reach 30 units per acre on specific sites in the area surrounding the project.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Recommended Projects**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for Recommended Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$44,196,000</td>
<td>$20,701,000</td>
<td>$19,110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$97,225,514</td>
<td>$44,197,682</td>
<td>$19,110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 14, 2006
The BLUE line on this expanded view of the proposed #14 bus route is IDENTICAL to the route followed by the #13 bus between MISSION VALLEY and SDSU prior to the opening of the Green Line trolley station at GRANTVILLE, so IDENTICAL that it bypasses GRANTVILLE STATION.
The names of the trolley stops have been superimposed to indicate the stations on the Green Line that the #14 bus would serve with proper timing: Mission Valley, Rio Vista, Fenton Parkway, Mission San Diego, and Grantville.
The current route of the #14 bus, shown in RED, terminates at Grantville Station.
Over 600 signatures of people have been submitted to the MTS Board asking that the proposed #14 bus route be routed to Grantville Station. A 3 minute DVD shows the many advantages trolley passengers could have if they can make a timely connection to the PROPOSED #14 bus route at Grantville Station.
Please watch the DVD and then help me convince the MTS Board to make Grantville Station a stop on the #14 bus route.

Thank you and God bless you.

Don Stillwell
6308 Rancho Mission Road, #173
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 282-7760
March 15, 2006

Mr. Harry Mathis  
President/CEO  
Metropolitan Transit System  
Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA  92101-7490

Dear Mr. Mathis,

Kaiser Permanente, located in the heart of the Grantville area, is respectfully requesting that Bus Route #14 be retained in service to our community residents, workers, visitors and in particular, patients.

The impact of losing this route for the riders that rely on #14 to come and go from our medical facilities in the Grantville area will be significant. Many of the riders who take the bus to our Medical Center on Zion Avenue are those with special needs, including limited vision, physical challenges, frail elderly, and limited ambulatory abilities. An additional 300 yard distance will impose a particular hardship on many of these already challenged individuals.

Thank you for giving consideration to our concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sylvia Wallace  
Public Affairs  
Kaiser Permanente, San Diego

cc: Diane Strum
the swoop project

Materials Prepared
For
SANDAG
Transportation Committee
March 17, 2006

Jake Peters
Visiting Scholar, UC – Davis
Institute of Transportation Studies
P.O. Box 3486
Ketchum, ID 83340

Executive Summary – The Problem

• Traffic congestion is a big problem
• Your local economy is reliant on mobility
• Traffic congestion will get worse
  – Roadway expansion lags population growth
  – ~11% of the County is already paved
• Transit expansion is favored
• Tolling is emerging
Question:
Is This Full, or Nearly Empty?

Answer:
It's about 92% empty
Highway Volumes...the Good News

- Capacity is >2,000 vehicles/hour
- Roads are pervasive
  - 1.3% of the U.S. is paved

Most roads, most of the time, work very well

---

A Small Portion of Roads Accommodate Most Driving

California Urban Driving - '02

- Highways carry 45% of all California urban driving
- Highways represent only 3% of California urban roads
Illustration:
Maximum Volume ~2,000 VPH

The More Complete Answer:
A ‘Full Lane’ is ~92% Empty....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway spatial efficiency @ peak throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headway (distance between bumpers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle area as a % of roadway pavement @ peak density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Assumes ~10% of vehicles are 50' trucks
Alas, the Bad News

An urban highway lane

- Volume >2,000 vehicles/hour is “unstable”
- This instability often results in degraded performance
  - Lower throughput; ~1,300 vehicles/hour
  - Lower speeds; 15-25 mph
  - Very large time periods are required to clear the lane

Thus, as traffic volumes increase, the throughput typically decreases

The “Incident”

Movie
the swoop project

This is a solvable problem:

1) San Diego has lots of [underutilized] pavement
2) Congestion is limited to a small minority of your roads
3) Usually limited to certain times of the day
4) "Technology" is underutilized

What are the Goals?

- Significant new capacity for private vehicles
- More effective transit service
- Affordable
- Don't threaten existing "powers"

Voters drive & business relies on trucks
Be progressive
There is no "extra" money
Live in the real world
Step #1 – Are Dedicated BRT Lanes Too Difficult & Costly to Deploy?

Movie

Not really

Step #2 – Guidance Technology Needs to Get Better

Movie

That is true....but what if you could....
Step #3 – Sell Congestion Relief

To fleet operators....initially

Vehicular Guidance Technology – Big Advances

Phileas – Commercially available ($1.7MM)

GM to Launch Self-driving System
Posted Aug 26, 2005, 4:00 PM ET by Lu Zhou

Component costs are decreasing as sensing & actuation proliferates

Darpa Grand Challenge
Stanford/Stanley
Folutely autonomous
131 mile course
19 mph (<7 hours)
Four teams finished
A Deployment Opportunity is Emerging


- New program pending Tier 1 funding authorization
  - Focused on BRT technology applications
- Four applications are under consideration
  - Precision docking
  - Vehicle guidance
  - Platooning
  - Automated operations

Should San Diego Pursue This?

- Shoulder bus operations
- Managed lanes
  - Explore the time-shifting of truck traffic
- Toll revenue opportunity
  - Choices
- Think big – Double your existing capacity?

How can you provide adequate mobility in the face of huge population growth?
Bayshore Bikeway Plan Update
March, 2006
Bayshore Bikeway Plan Objectives

- Develop a continuous bike path around the Bay
- Coordinate bikeway improvements with local plans
Bayshore Bikeway
Plan Components

- Existing Conditions
- Planning and Policy Context
- Needs Analysis
- Recommended Improvements
- Cost Estimates
- Design & Management Guidelines
Bayshore Bikeway
Plan Components

- Existing Conditions
- Planning and Policy Context
- Needs Analysis
- Recommended Improvements
- Cost Estimates
- Design & Management Guidelines

Bayshore Bikeway
Planning and Policy Context

Old Police Headquarters/Seaport Village
Bayshore Bikeway Plan Components

- Existing Conditions
- Planning and Policy Context
- Needs Analysis
- Recommended Improvements
- Cost Estimates
- Design & Management Guidelines
Bayshore Bikeway Plan Components

- Existing Conditions
- Planning and Policy Context
- Needs Analysis
- Recommended Improvements
- Cost Estimates
- Design & Management Guidelines

**Construction** $7,966,000
**Engineering** 1,195,000
**Environmental** 797,000
**Total Cost** $9,958,000

Recommended Intersection Design
Bayshore Bikeway Plan Update
Public Outreach
San Diego Bay Stakeholders
- Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, National City, San Diego
- County of San Diego
- Unified Port District
- Metropolitan Transit System
- Centre City Development Corporation
- U.S. Navy
- San Diego Gas & Electric
- National Steel and Ship Building
- San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- Caltrans
- Save Our Heritage Organization
- San Diego Electric Railway Association

Bayshore Bikeway Working Group

Supervisor Greg Cox (Chair)  County of San Diego
Councilmember Phil Monroe  City of Coronado
Councilmember John McCann  City of Chula Vista
Councilmember Fred McLean  City of Imperial Beach
Councilmember Rosalie Zarate  City of National City
Councilmember Kevin Faulconer  City of San Diego
Commissioner William Hall  Port District
Gordy Shields  Bicycling Community
Bayshore Bikeway

Recommended Improvements
Bayshore Bikeway

Western Salt Project

Bayshore Bikeway
Plan Update
Bayshore Bikeway
Plan Update