TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Thursday, June 13, 2002
12:15 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• STATE ROUTE 125 GAP AND CONNECTOR BUDGET INCREASE

• HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER PROJECTS - FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

• CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG's Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. Email comments should be received no later than noon on the Tuesday preceding the Thursday Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300 or fax (619) 595-5305.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PLANNING AND DESIGNING FOR PEDESTRIANS, MODEL GUIDELINES FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION (Stephan Vance) recommendation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (Sookyung Kim) recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES - SAN DIEGO - SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD ACTIONS (Linda Culp) information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS (Speakers limited to three minutes each.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
+ 5. **STATE ROUTE 125 GAP AND CONNECTOR BUDGET INCREASE**
(Dean Hiatt)

California Transportation Ventures (CTV) has requested an additional $8.36 million to fund cost increases on the SR 125 Gap and Connector project between SR 54 and the SR 125 Toll Road and north to the Sweetwater segment of SR 125 currently under construction. The additional funding is for higher costs for right-of-way, water quality monitoring, and inflation adjustments caused by delays in obtaining certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, a lack of freeway agreement between Caltrans and the County, and contract negotiations. The Transportation Committee is asked to review CTV’s request and recommend it to the SANDAG Board of Directors with stipulations.

+ 6. **HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER PROGRAM – PROPOSED PROJECT FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**
(Richard Chavez)

In November 2001, the SANDAG Board of Directors set aside $1.98 million from the 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for freeway noise barrier projects and approved a policy and criteria for prioritizing these projects for fund allocation. SANDAG staff and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) have evaluated the eight eligible project proposals and jointly recommend the top three projects for funding. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend the proposed projects to the SANDAG Board for fund allocation from the 2002 STIP.

+ 7. **CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**
(Mario Oropeza)

As the designated Congestion Management Agency for the San Diego region, SANDAG is required to prepare and update the Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years. At its May 9, 2002 meeting, the Transportation Committee received a presentation on the 2002 CMP update and asked staff to return with additional information about what has been done in the past with the CMP compared to what is proposed with the 2002 update. The current CMP schedule calls for review of the draft CMP by the Transportation Committee in July and a presentation to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its August 2, 2002 meeting.

+ 8. **CENTRAL I-5 CORRIDOR STUDY – STATUS REPORT**
(Mike Hix)

Staff will provide a status report of the Central I-5 Corridor Study, which is evaluating potential solutions for access to and from Interstate 5, along with improved north-south mobility through the entire corridor. The study is evaluating access needs to Lindbergh Field, the Port of San Diego marine terminals, the Downtown Ballpark, the Old Town Transit Center, and other major activity centers in the study area, which is bounded by Sea World Drive on the north, State Route 54 on the south, the San Diego Bay on the west, and I-805 on the east.

THE NEXT TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING IS TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2002.

The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

This agenda is sent to all members of the SANDAG/RTC Board of Directors and alternates for informational purposes.
PLANNING AND DESIGNING FOR PEDESTRIANS,
MODEL GUIDELINES FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

Introduction

At the April 26, 2002 Board of Directors meeting, the Board accepted the draft Model Pedestrian Design Guidelines for distribution. Copies of the final draft have been distributed and the comment period has closed. Comments were received from four jurisdictions, Caltrans, MTDB and several members of the Walkable Communities Advisory Committee. Details regarding the comments and the staff response to those comments are presented in Attachment 1.

None of the comments requested changes to specific design elements in the Guidelines, though some did note that the Guidelines promoted design features that differed from currently adopted design standards. Wherever possible, the document was modified to accommodate the concerns raised. In order to reflect its broad scope, and to make it more clear that SANDAG is not promulgating a design standard, staff is recommending that the name be changed to Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region. Copies of the document will be available at the Transportation Committee meeting.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend adoption of Planning and Designing for Pedestrians by the SANDAG Board as a model for encouraging walking as a mode of transportation in the San Diego region.

Discussion

The purpose of Planning and Designing for Pedestrians is to provide a resource to help local agencies create communities that encourage walking as a mode of transportation. As the document was being developed, the project consultants and staff met with the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Plan Working Group (the Cities and County planning directors), the San Diego Traffic Engineers Council (SANTEC), and of course the Walkable Communities Advisory Committee (WCAC). After receiving comments from all of these groups, the consultant team prepared a draft that the Board accepted for distribution in April 2002. Comments received are summarized Attachment 1.

While not every detailed design question could be addressed within the scope of this document, staff did try to respond to every substantive issue raised during the review period. Planning and Designing for Pedestrians was written to be a comprehensive reference for the region’s planners and engineers. Approval of the document by the SANDAG Board is only the first step of a process in which policy makers and professionals should re-evaluate how we design for pedestrians in the San Diego region.
1. **Comment:** Several comments related to how SANDAG intended to use the guidelines.

**Response:** Once the document is accepted by SANDAG, SANDAG will undertake an outreach effort to present the principles in the document to each local jurisdiction in the region. The objective of this effort will be to encourage each agency to re-evaluate its own design standards to see where changes might be appropriate to better accommodate pedestrians. The recommendations in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians differ from existing adopted design standards for most agencies in the region. However, all of the recommendations are within the bounds of generally accepted engineering standards, and every recommended treatment has been implemented somewhere within the state of California. The City of San Diego is in the process of revising its street design manual. The draft manual currently being reviewed by the City is consistent with Planning and Designing for Pedestrians in every substantive way. In fact, a significant portion of the manuals discussion on pedestrian-oriented design comes directly from SANDAG’s draft document.

2. **Comment:** Several agencies argued that transportation funding decisions should not be contingent on local agencies adopting these pedestrian design concepts as local standards, or that projects submitted for funding should not be required to be consistent with the document.

**Response:** This question previously came before the Transportation Committee and the Board in relation to the regional arterial funds that were programmed in May 2002. SANDAG should try to encourage more pedestrian-friendly design through its funding decisions, but the method for doing this is a topic for additional discussion. It is a process that is likely to evolve over time, and will ultimately be the decision of the Board of Directors Planning and Designing for Pedestrians does not discuss the issue of project funding.

3. **Comment:** Early on in the process of developing the guidelines, we heard concerns from the engineering community that the document might be misconstrued as establishing a design standard to which they subsequently would have to adhere.

**Response:** The format of the document was significantly revised. It no longer describes certain design features as “standards” and specific design treatments are recommended without characterizing them as design guidance.

4. **Comment:** The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) commented that the document is consistent with the current MTDB design standards, but suggested that greater emphasis should be put on the section that deals with the specifics of site and street design.

**Response:** These design details are very important. More details have been added to that section, but the broad scope of the document necessarily limits the depth to which any one section can go. The land use and zoning issues addressed in the document also are important because of their effect on walkability.
5. **Comment:** A number of reviewers observed that the scope of the document was so broad that it might be hard to use to answer specific design questions.

**Response:** A subject matter index has been added. This issue again touches on the comprehensive way that the document treats walkability. The intent was not to create a pedestrian design manual, but to treat walkability in all its aspects. This broad perspective will make the document more useful as reference to broader land use issues as SANDAG develops the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

6. **Comment:** The San Diego Police Department supported the recommendations related to designs that put more eyes on the street, as well as the recommendations for improved pedestrian-scale lighting. However, the comments also requested more detail in the discussion of alleys and building facades to discourage creating hiding places for criminal activity. They also requested a discussion on graffiti prevention, especially in reference to the public transit facilities and public art recommended in the document.

**Response:** These issues have been addressed with a little more detail in the design discussion and by discussing the effective use of surface materials to discourage graffiti. One of the principles underlying the document is that well designed public places are active places that discourage criminal and antisocial behavior.
2002 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)

Introduction

SANDAG, serving as the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), is required by state and federal law to develop and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) every two years. The RTIP is a multi-year program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and non-motorized projects, including the TransNet Program of Projects. The 2002 RTIP includes programs for highway, transit, local street & road, and other projects covering the five-year period FY 2003 through FY 2007.

At its May 24, 2002 meeting, the SANDAG Board accepted the draft 2002 RTIP for distribution and public comment and scheduled a public hearing for the June 28, 2002 Board meeting. Notices of availability of the draft document have been sent to all interested parties, and the draft report is available on the SANDAG Web site. In addition, a notice for the June 28 public hearing was published in several newspapers of general circulation. Based on comments received to date, there are a number of proposed changes to the draft RTIP which are summarized in Attachment 1.

The Board also was advised at the May meeting that, due to statewide funding constraints, California Transportation Commission (CTC) may not be able to program all of the San Diego region’s projects proposed for 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding. These projects may need to seek alternative funding sources or schedule adjustments. The region’s remaining programming issues fall into one of the following three categories:

- Projects Not Yet Approved As Part of the 2002 STIP Process
- Projects Previously Approved By SANDAG But Not Yet Amended into the STIP by CTC
- Other Miscellaneous Programming Issues

Working with affected local agencies and within CTC programming guidelines, staff is recommending specific programming actions within the context of the 2002 RTIP process and proposed financial strategy to address the remaining issues in the future (Attachment 2).

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee review the proposed changes to the draft 2002 RTIP and the amendment to the 2000 RTIP as provided in Attachment 1 and recommend approval of the revised draft 2002 RTIP to the full Board for consideration and adoption at its June 28, 2002 meeting. It is also recommended the Transportation Committee review the proposed
funding strategies for the region’s remaining programming issues as shown in Attachment 2 and provide comments and/or direction.

Discussion

Changes to the Draft RTIP

Since the distribution of the draft 2002 RTIP on May 24, 2002, staff has received requests for additions and other changes. Attachment 1 lists the proposed changes received to date to be incorporated in the final 2002 RTIP. Any additional requests for revisions or other comments that may be received after mail out of this report will be discussed with the Transportation Committee and/or Board of Directors prior to the final adoption.

In addition, as part of the FY 2002 federal appropriations bill, the San Diego region received federal discretionary funds for several projects, including $4 million in Interstate Maintenance Discretionary program (IMD) funds for the I-5 corridor and $8.25 million in Corridor and Borders Infrastructure (CBI) funds for the SR 905 project. In order to fund some of the projects discussed below, it is recommended that the $4 million in IMD funds be exchanged with a like amount of STIP funds from the I-5 HOV/Managed Lane project. The IMD funds can only be used along the I-5 corridor, whereas the STIP funds are more flexible and can be used for other projects. Federal guidelines dictate that the IMD and $971,000 (out of the $8.25 million) in CBI funds must be obligated by September 30, 2002. Since the 2002 RTIP covers the period beginning FY 2003, the proposed exchange will have to be part of a 2000 RTIP amendment. The proposed Amendment No. 12.1 to the 2000 RTIP also is described in Attachment 1.

Remaining Programming Issues and Proposed Funding Strategies

With the adoption of the 2002 STIP, the CTC indicated that only $123 million statewide remains to be programmed in the 2002 STIP period (FY 2003 through FY 2007). Local projects that were not included in the original 2002 STIP approval in April 2002 will need to compete with other projects statewide for these remaining funds.

A remaining need of $52 million in STIP funds has been identified. It is anticipated that there will be strong competition for the remaining $123 million in STIP funds by all jurisdictions throughout the state. Given that the San Diego region received approval for the majority of the STIP requests in the 2002 cycle (despite the statewide funding issues), and that the region’s formula share of STIP funds is approximately 7 percent, it is unlikely that the San Diego region will receive all of the $52 million in requests for additional 2002 STIP funds. However, staff is proposing to request the additional $52 million from the $123 million available statewide, while at the same time developing alternative programming strategies.

The funding status and the proposed strategies for each project are summarized in Attachment 2.

Federal Air Quality Conformity Requirements

Federal metropolitan planning and air quality regulations prescribe the air quality conformity process for the RTIP. These regulations require that SANDAG conduct an air quality conformity analysis of all regionally significant projects that increase capacity of the transportation system. This
includes major local and privately funded projects and any other state or federally funded projects that might not otherwise appear in the RTIP, as well as new projects or major changes in project scope for existing programmed projects.

The quantitative emissions analysis for the 2002 RTIP has been conducted and results show that the 2002 RTIP meets the air quality conformity requirements. The San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG) has reviewed the draft conformity analysis. No comments have been received to date. The final conformity analysis will be issued as part of the final 2002 RTIP action at the June 28, 2002 Board meeting.

On July 21, 2000, SANDAG found the 2000 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan for the San Diego region. The projects included in Amendment No. 12.1 were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2000 RTIP. Therefore, the 2000 RTIP, including Amendment No. 12.1, remains in conformance with the air quality program.

**Schedule**

If the Board adopts the 2002 RTIP at its June 28 meeting, the final document will be forwarded to Caltrans by the August 1, 2002 deadline. SANDAG’s RTIP will be incorporated as part of the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) to be submitted to Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration prior to October 6, 2002 for approval.
New Projects to be Added to the 2002 RTIP

1. **MTDB – LRT Station Low-Floor Vehicle Modification**: As part of the Mission Valley East Light Rail project, MTDB is procuring low floor rail vehicles. The existing station platforms and trackways will need to be modified and retrofitted to operate the new low floor vehicles. The $8 million needed for this project will be funded from TransNet.

2. **MTDB – Nobel Drive Station**: This project will construct a new commuter rail station at Nobel Drive. This project previously received $6.6 million in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5309 New Starts funding. The total project cost is $13.5 million ($6.6 million FTA, $412,000 in state, and $6.5 million in TransNet funds).

3. **SANDAG - Joint Traffic Operations Center (JTOC)**: This project would establish the JTOC in downtown San Diego to coordinate traffic related to the Ballpark, Convention Center, the airport, and other downtown attractions. The JTOC also includes integration of freeway, arterial, transit and parking management systems. This project is funded with $1.5 million in federal Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) discretionary funds and $960,000 in state only STIP funds. The total project cost is $2.46 million.

4. **SANDAG – Regional Arterial Monitoring System (RAMS)**: This project will install a signal integration network connecting all jurisdictions regionwide. The project is funded with $2.25 million in CMAQ and $280,000 in state only STIP funds. The total project cost is $2.53 million.

5. **SANDAG – Advanced Traveler Information System (ATIS)**: This project implements the ATIS including commercial vehicle tracking and 511 telephone information system. This project is funded with $3.5 million in CMAQ, $4.3 million in ITS, and $1.4 million in state only STIP funds for a total project cost of $9.2 million.

6. **San Dieguito Transportation Cooperative (SDTC) – School Bus Facility**: The SDTC is a Joint Powers Authority that provides school bus service for six public school districts in the North County. SDTC received $273,000 from the FTA 5309 Bus Discretionary program to improve and expand the existing facility to maintain, fuel and store the school buses. A $500,000 Housing and Urban Development grant brings the total project cost to $773,000.

Revisions to the 2002 RTIP

1. **Caltrans - San Diego Amtrak Maintenance Facility**: The current programming reflects both the State Transportation Improvement Program – Interregional Program (STIP-IIP) and Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds. However, since an allocation for the TCRP funds has not yet been requested, it is proposed the TCRP funds be removed until such time as the project receives approval for additional allocation from CTC. The project cost is reduced to $9 million.

2. **Caltrans – Oceanside Double Track Project**: The current programming reflects the total $25 million in TCRP funds set aside for double tracking the coastal corridor. However, since only $6 million has been approved for the project by CTC, it is proposed that the remaining $19 million be removed until such time as additional allocations are approved by CTC. The new total project cost is $6 million.
3. **Caltrans – SR 52 Cuyamaca to SR 67**: Currently $5.7 million (FY 2004) and $4.9 million (FY 2005) are programmed for right-of-way (ROW). The proposed revision is to advance the $10.6 million into FY 2003 as it is anticipated that ROW can be purchased early.

4. **Caltrans – SHOPP Lump Sum**: The lump sum listing includes various projects for highway safety, roadway rehabilitation, and safety projects. The proposed revision is to highlight some of the larger, more significant projects separately, such as auxiliary lanes along I-8 and I-15. The new total for the SHOPP lump sum listing is $118 million.

5. **MTDB – Mission Valley East Light Rail Project**: To address potential cost increases to the project, MTDB proposes to add $20 million in TransNet funds. The total project cost is $444 million.

6. **MTDB – Mid-Coast Corridor Project**: The current program includes the design phase only. The proposed revision is to add the right-of-way and construction phases from Old Town Transit Center to Balboa Avenue and to undertake additional planning studies for alternative alignments along the corridor, and to begin the preliminary engineering for the University City phase. The total cost of the project is $100.1 million. MTDB anticipates receipt of a Full Funding Grant Agreement from FTA.

7. Other minor technical changes.

### Amendment No 12.1 to the 2000 RTIP

Two projects that received FY 2002 federal discretionary funds need to be obligated by September 30, 2002. As a result, the projects need to be programmed as 2000 RTIP amendment to avoid a loss of federal discretionary funds. Below are the amendments for the two projects.

1. **Caltrans - I-5/HOV Managed Lanes**: This project includes the environmental phase for the HOV/Managed Lanes project along I-5 from San Diego to Oceanside. This $10 million project is funded with $3.5 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), $500,000 in state only STIP as a match, and $6 million in STIP-RIP. The amendment proposes to exchange $4 million from STIP-RIP with $4 million in Interstate Maintenance Discretionary (IMD) funds. The $4,000 million in STIP funds will be used to fund other projects as discussed in the main report, and programmed in the 2002 RTIP. The project's total cost remains $10 million ($3.5 million in RSTP, $500,000 in STIP match, $2 million STIP-RIP, and $4 million IMD).

2. **Caltrans – SR 905 Siempre Viva (Stage 1) & New Freeway (Stages 2-4)**: This project will construct SR 905 from Airway Road to the Otay Mesa Port of Entry (Stage 1) and from I-805 to Otay Mesa Border Crossing (Stages 2-4). The amendment proposes to add $971,000 in Corridors and Borders Infrastructure (CBI) funds to Stage 1. The amendment also proposes to exchange funds between the Stage 1 and Stages 2-4 in order to fully fund Stage 1 and to ensure the timely obligation of federal CBI funds. The total project cost for Stage 1 is $29.2 million ($21.7 in CBI, $1.3 million in STIP-IIP, and $6.2 million in TCRP). The $971,000 is included in the $21.7 CBI total. The total project cost for Stages 2-4 is $206.6 million ($5.5 million in CBI, $54.5 million in federal Demonstration, $97.7 million in STIP-IIP, $26 million in STIP-RIP, and $18.8 million in TCRP). The City of San Diego is also contributing $4 million in local TransNet funds.
### Initial 2002 Fall RTIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial 2002 RTIP</td>
<td>Fall RTIP Amend.</td>
<td>Future RTIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Not Yet Approved As Part of the 2002 STIP Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proposed Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Arterials</td>
<td>$22,163</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$8,437</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Request for additional 2002 STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit First Reserve</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New federal STP or CMAQ allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Soundwall Program</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td>$1,929</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional 2002 STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP/CMAQ Local Match Reserve</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$1,476</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exchanged STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho del Oro Extension</td>
<td>$1,121</td>
<td>$1,121</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exchanged STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside-Escondido Rail Project</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for additional 2002 STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Previously Approved by SANDAG But Not Yet Amended Into the STIP by CTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proposed Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland Rail Trail</td>
<td>$8,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,150</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,150</td>
<td>Request for additional 2002 STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>Request for additional 2002 STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Miscellaneous Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>FY 06</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proposed Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 125 Gap/Connector</td>
<td>$8,360</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,360</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,360</td>
<td>New federal STP allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th St Landscaping</td>
<td>$803</td>
<td></td>
<td>$803</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$803</td>
<td>Exchanged STIP funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125 Sweetwater Claims</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>TransNet Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/SR 56 CBI Match</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Program once committed match is identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**: $27,407 $27,435 $21,697 $0 $0 $76,539
Projects Not Yet Approved As Part of the 2002 STIP Process

These projects include potential candidates from the reserves established by the Board with the initial 2002 STIP submittal and additional projects submitted to the CTC with the February 2002 revision, but which were not approved by CTC as part of the 2002 STIP in April.

**Regional Arterial System ($35 million):** At the May 24, 2002 meeting, the SANDAG Board approved the allocation of $35 million in regional State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP-RIP) funds to seven regional arterial projects. The funding strategy for these projects is to seek funds from the $123 million in STIP funds remaining statewide. Initially the projects would need to be programmed in FY 2006 or later, but efforts would be undertaken to advance the funding as part of a future STIP amendment. If efforts to receive additional STIP funds are unsuccessful, the next step would be to examine opportunities to exchange funding with currently programmed projects that have been delayed.

Since the 2002 RTIP must be submitted by August 1, 2002 and the outcome of the STIP funding request will not be known until after the submittal date, these funds will not be included in the current 2002 RTIP, but will be included as an amendment once the funding source(s) have been identified.

**Transit First Project Reserve ($10 million):** As part of the Regional Transit Vision (RTV), the Board approved a reserve of $10 million for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service. Although RTV demonstration projects have been identified, specific routes, costs, and schedules have not been established at this time. Since STIP guidelines require that specific projects be identified and a Project Study Report (PSR) or PSR equivalent be completed before STIP funds can be programmed, it is proposed that the funding for these projects be deferred until the new federal re-authorization bill is enacted and that the projects be funded with either Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) or Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

Since neither specific projects nor funding have been identified to date, this project will not be included in the 2002 RTIP, but will be included in an amendment once funding is identified.

**Regional Soundwall Program ($1.929 million):** The Board also approved a STIP reserve for this program. Specific projects have been identified and are discussed under Agenda No. 7. The same basic funding strategy as discussed above for the Regional Arterial System is proposed for the Soundwall program.

**RSTP/CMAQ Local Match Reserve ($2.176 million):** Both CMAQ and RSTP funded projects require a local match. Specifically, four regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects, including the Regional Transportation Monitoring System, Advanced Traveler Information System, Joint Traffic Operation Center, and Regional Arterial Monitoring System, require matching funds. The matching funds are proposed to come from the STIP funds to be exchanged for IMD funds. A total of $2.176 million would be used as RSTP/CMAQ match ($600,000 in FY 2003 and $1.476 million in FY 2004). These ITS projects are proposed for inclusion in the final 2002 RTIP.
City of Oceanside – Rancho Del Oro ($1.121 million): The SANDAG Board approved additional STIP funds for this project as part of the 2002 STIP process. However, the CTC did not approve the requested funding in its initial STIP action in April 2002. It is proposed that the funding for this project also come out of the proposed IMD fund exchange. This project is already included in the 2002 RTIP.

North County Transit District – Oceanside to Escondido Rail Project ($4.9 million): The SANDAG Board approved $4.9 million in STIP funds to fully fund the rail project contingent upon the approval of the federal Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) which is still pending. The requested STIP funds for the project in FY 2005 were not approved by the CTC in its initial 2002 STIP action in April 2002. The proposed funding strategy is to seek the additional $4.9 million as part of the upcoming process to allocate the remaining $123 million STIP funds statewide. Although the funds would need to be programmed in FY 2006 or later, it may be possible to advance the funds through future STIP amendments. If efforts to obtain additional STIP funds are unsuccessful, the project will be deferred to the 2004 STIP and staff will coordinate with NCTD regarding other funding options.

Projects Previously Approved by SANDAG But Not Yet Amended into the STIP By CTC

These projects were previously approved for STIP funding by SANDAG, but they have not yet been approved by the CTC:

Bayshore Bikeway ($1.7 million)/Inland Rail Trail ($8.15 million): The SANDAG Board approved $1 million and $8.15 million in STIP funds respectively for these two projects. Due to environmental issues, the Bayshore Bikeway project has been delayed and is in need of an additional $700,000. The North County Transit District has agreed to include the Inland Rail Trail construction as part of the Oceanside to Escondido Rail project. As a result, the project schedule has been moved out to FY 2004. It is proposed that funds for these projects be sought from the $123 million in STIP funds remaining statewide. Initially the projects would need to be programmed in FY 2006 or later. Efforts will be made to advance the funding as part of a future STIP amendment. If efforts to receive additional STIP funds are unsuccessful, it is proposed that the projects be funded from the next federal re-authorization bill, most likely from the CMAQ program.

These projects will be revised in the 2002 RTIP based on currently approved funding. The RTIP will be amended once the additional funding is committed.

Other Miscellaneous Programming Issues

Caltrans – SR 125 Gap/Connector ($8.36 million): Agenda No. 5 discusses the need for additional funds for this project. Should the Committee recommend to the Board the approval of additional funding to cover the cost increase, the proposed strategy is to defer the actual program action until the new federal re-authorization bill is enacted and fund the project with RSTP funds. The additional funds will be included in a future RTIP amendment once funds have been committed.

Caltrans – SR 15-40th Street Landscaping ($803,000): As part of the SR 15-40th Street soundwall project, an additional $803,000 is needed for landscaping purposes. The project has been underway and is near completion. It is proposed that the project be funded as part of the STIP/IMD exchange. The additional $803,000 will be added to the existing project in the 2002 RTIP.
Caltrans - SR 125 Sweetwater ($2 million): This project is complete but additional funds are needed to close out the project. The proposed strategy is to use TransNet funds. The additional TransNet Highway funds would be added to the existing project in the 2002 RTIP.

Caltrans/City of San Diego - I-5/SR 56 Interchange Study ($500,000): As part of the FY 2002 federal appropriations bill, this project received $1.942 million in CBI funds. Like other federal programs, CBI requires a local match of $500,000. Since STIP funds are not eligible to use as a match for CBI funds, SANDAG has not yet identified a funding source to match the federal appropriation. It is proposed that this project be deferred until the local match can be identified and amended into the RTIP at a future date. Staff will work with Caltrans and the City of San Diego to identify a funding source.
LOS ANGELES – SAN DIEGO – SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY (LOSSAN) BOARD ACTIONS

Introduction

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency coordinates planning and programming that 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. 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. A summary of Board Actions from the May 17, 2002 meeting is provided as Attachment 2.

This item is provided as information.
MEMBERSHIP

This board is composed of 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) 595-5357; lcu@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit Development Board

Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Tom Wilson
Orange County Transportation Authority

Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

Bill Davis
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Joni Gray
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Dave Ekbon
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Warren Weber
Caltrans, Division of Rail

Alternates

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Susan Rose
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Fred Munroe
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Ex Officio Member

Vacant
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
LOSSAN ADVOCACY STRATEGY
The Board of Directors approved a strategy recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to be used as a framework for priorities of the agency. This strategy addresses (1) funding including existing and new funds, reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), and support for a dedicated, stable source for Amtrak, (2) maintain and expand service levels, (3) support efforts to increase rail safety and security, and (4) support for community development projects related to the rail corridor.

The Board also directed staff to contact the corridor’s federal delegation asking for their support for the reauthorization of TEA-21, and specifically as it addresses LOSSAN.

LOSSAN LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT
The Board of Directors reaffirmed the agency’s support for Amtrak by adopting a Resolution of Support for an FY 2003 federal appropriation to continue the agency and to establish a stable funding source for capital and operations. This Resolution and the LOSSAN fact sheet will be distributed to the corridor’s federal delegation.

The Board of Directors took a position of support for two federal legislative efforts related to funding for Amtrak. The High Speed Rail Investment Act provides $12 billion in bonding authority for high-speed rail corridors. The Rail Infrastructure Development Act authorizes $59 billion for high-speed rail, commuter, and freight improvements nationwide. The Board expressed concern over labor provisions in a third federal bill, the National Defense Rail Act that could be detrimental to the corridor’s commuter rail operators, and directed the TAC to monitor this legislation. Should these labor provisions be deleted, the TAC is authorized to support this legislation on behalf of the Board.

The Board of Directors also approved support for expanded Amtrak service between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo and to seek state funding. The rail operator along that portion of the corridor, Union Pacific, recently gave approval to Caltrans to operate this service beginning with one additional weekend train in May 2002.

CALIFORNIA RAIL PLAN
The Board of Directors heard an update from Caltrans on the California Rail Plan, a 10-year state rail plan for both passenger and freight rail services. The plan is consistent with the first 10 years of Amtrak’s 20-year improvement plan and was recently approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).
STATUS OF LOSSAN PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR FUNDING UNDER THE FY 2002 INTERREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (ITIP)

In June 2001, the LOSSAN Board recommended 18 rail projects between San Diego and San Luis Obispo to Caltrans for consideration in the FY 2002 ITIP, which is one portion of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (see Table 1). The CTC recently approved the proposed list of funded projects, including nine projects from the LOSSAN priority list. These provide more than $35 million to the corridor.

STATUS OF THE CALTRANS/ CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY (CHSRA) TECHNICAL STUDIES

The Board of Directors received a report from Caltrans and the CHSRA who are working cooperatively on technical studies in the LOSSAN corridor between Los Angeles Union Station and downtown San Diego that will lead to a programmatic environmental impact report for each agency. (This Coastal Corridor is one of five identified by the CHSRA statewide.) The agencies recently completed a number of public scoping meetings. An inland alternative in south Orange County will be incorporated into the study.

PACIFIC SURFLINER REPORT

The Board received a report from Amtrak on intercity ridership and revenue on the Pacific Surfliner Corridor. For the past six months, ridership and revenue on the corridor have generally increased over the same period a year ago. A key statistic has been that on-time performance for 2002 continues to exceed 90 percent.

RECOGNITION OF RETIRING BOARD MEMBER, SARAH CATZ

The LOSSAN Board recognized retiring board member Sarah Catz, representing OCTA, for her ten years of service to the rail corridor agency.

The Board of Directors will next meet on September 20, 2002 at MTA at 12:00 p.m. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for June 18, 2002 at MTA at 12:00 p.m.
Table 1
LOSSAN PRIORITIES FOR FY2002 ITIP FUNDING

(All dollars shown are in thousands; ITIP funded projects are in **bold.**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Existing (incl. ITIP)</th>
<th>Funding Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Avenue Double Track</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$14,894</td>
<td>$14,894</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$27,200</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock Storage/Maintenance Facility (LA)</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark to Goleta CTC</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada to Basta Triple Track</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$25,800</td>
<td>$25,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Transit Center</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf to Guadalupe Siding Extension</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo/</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT Junction to La Mirada Triple Track</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Union Station Improvements (Ramps)</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach Station Parking Structure</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Station Parking Structure</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Station Parking Structure</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Margarita River Bridge Replacement and Second Track Project</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$31,400</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
<td>$23,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct Bridge 4th Crossing Arroyo Simi</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements to Crossings Moorpark to Simi Valley</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Station Improvements</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Retrofit of Tunnel 26</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$13,712</td>
<td>$13,712</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Rail</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$249,806</td>
<td>$152,106*</td>
<td>$ 97,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes $35 million in FY 2002 ITIP funding
STATE ROUTE 125 GAP AND CONNECTOR BUDGET INCREASE

Introduction

Caltrans and California Transportation Ventures (CTV) entered into a Development Franchise Agreement to allow CTV to design and construct the SR 125 Toll Road between Otay Mesa Road and San Miguel Road in 1991. In December 1996, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Resolution RC97-7 requesting that Caltrans and CTV include Stage 6 of SR 54/125 Sweetwater (“Gap”) and the San Miguel Connector (SR 125 between SR 54 and San Miguel Road), commonly referred to as the “Gap and Connector,” into their franchise agreement. The franchise agreement was amended to include the additional segments on February 28, 1997.

In September 2000, CTV received bids to design and construct the SR 125 Gap, Connector, and Toll Road projects under a design-build process. The bids included options to develop the Gap and Connector as a separate contract or combined with the SR 125 Toll Road as a single contract. On September 22, 2000, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved a new budget of $130.22 million for the Gap and Connector reflecting the bid amount combined with the SR 125 Toll Road, contingencies, and other project costs, such as right-of-way and mitigation. CTV subsequently entered into a contract with Washington Group International (WGI) on May 11, 2001 with the intent that the entire project would be built as one.

The estimated cost of the Gap and Connector has increased by $8.36 million due to delays in obtaining the 401 certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the lack of a Freeway Agreement between Caltrans and the County of San Diego, and negotiations of contract terms between CTV and WGI. These delays have contributed to the late acquisition of right-of-way and delayed start of construction. The attached letter from CTV details the reasons for the increase.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board approve the proposed $8.36 million increase in the budget to $138.58 million for the development of the Gap and Connector, with the following stipulations:

- CTV shall issue an Unlimited Notice to Proceed for the Gap and Connector by August 15, 2002.
• Construction on the Gap shall begin no later than September 15, 2002.

• Construction on the Connector shall begin no later than October 15, 2002.

• Chula Vista will contribute an amount not to exceed $8,898 million to construct the Gap and Connector if constructed separately from the Toll Road.

• CTV will issue an Unlimited Notice to Proceed for the Toll Road immediately upon closing of financing with the ability to draw funds for the Toll Road. In the event that an Unlimited Notice to Proceed for the Toll Road is not issued by December 31, 2002, CTV will assign both the WGI Design-Build contract for the Gap and Connector and that portion of their Development Franchise Agreement with Caltrans relating to the Gap and Connector to SANDAG.

• CTV will construct the bridges on SR 54 concurrent with the Gap and Connector construction to accommodate the future west to south direct connector. Chula Vista will provide funding for this work (Option 7- not to exceed $ 2 million) to be reimbursed by CTV. The terms for reimbursement shall be a 7-year repayment from start of operation of the toll road with interest accrued at an index corresponding to the City of Chula Vista’s cost of money. An agreement between CTV and Chula Vista will be executed in the near future.

• CTV agrees to amend their Development Franchise Agreement with Caltrans to acknowledge that the commencement of construction on the Gap and/or Connector does not fulfill their obligation to commence construction and diligently pursue such construction to completion for the Toll Road portion of the project. CTV further agrees to commence construction of the Toll Road portion of the project within three years of the filing of the Notice of Determination by Caltrans.

Also recommended is the authorization of the SANDAG Executive Director to execute the Fourth Amendment to Supplemental Agreement No. 4 to the Master Agreement No. 11-0378 for Transportation Sales Tax Highway Projects between SANDAG and Caltrans and to acknowledge the Fourth Amendment to the Invoice and Disbursement Procedures Agreement and the Fifth Amendment to the Development Franchise Agreement between Caltrans and CTV.

Discussion

A 401 certification by the Regional Water Quality Control Board was required before the Army Corps of Engineers could issue a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This certification was obtained on April 24, 2001 the 404 permit was issued on July 30, 2001. The Freeway Agreement between Caltrans and the County of San Diego was approved on January 16, 2002. CTV is currently in the process of obtaining financing for the SR 125 Toll Road.

The contract for the design and construction of the SR 125 Gap and Connector stipulated that the bid was valid through December 31, 2001 and included the option to either terminate or renegotiate the contract. CTV and WGI chose to exercise the option of continuing with the contract and agreed to a budget revision in accordance with the contract provision for cost increases associated with the annual inflation factor of 2.8%, compounded monthly.
Attachment 1 is the letter from CTV requesting the additional funds. The request includes escalated costs for highway right-of-way, increases due to inflation as agreed in the contract, and additional water quality monitoring required by the 401 Certification. The total request is an increase of $8.36 million and, if approved, would result in a new budget of $138.58 million.

SANDAG, Caltrans, and CTV previously agreed that the cost to construct the SR 125 Gap and Connector shall not exceed the cost using the standard design-bid-build process. An independent estimate was calculated by an engineering consultant to determine the costs to develop the Gap and Connector under this standard process. The proposed budget remains approximately $5 million less than the independent estimate, inflated to current year dollars, and therefore complies with the not to exceed amount provided by the agreement.

Next Steps

If this recommendation is forwarded to the SANDAG Board of Directors and approved, a Fourth Amendment to Supplemental Agreement No. 4 to the Master Agreement No. 11-0378 for Transportation Sales Tax Highway Projects would be processed to authorize a revised budget cap and include the additional stipulations for the design and construction of the Gap and Connector. The new budget cap for the Gap and Connector would be $138.58 million. Caltrans and CTV would then concurrently process a Fourth Amendment to their Invoice and Disbursement Procedures Agreement and a Fifth Amendment to their Development Franchise Agreement. These agreements need to be acknowledged by SANDAG with the signature of the SANDAG Executive Director. The three amendments combined are required to finalize this request.
The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
HIGHWAY NOISE BARRIER PROGRAM – PROPOSED PROJECT FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Noise levels exceed state and federal criteria at numerous residential locations adjacent to existing highways in the San Diego region. Passage of Senate Bill 45 (Kopp) in 1997 delegated the responsibility of addressing existing highway noise impacts on residential areas from the state to the regions. In November 2001, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a revised Highway Noise Barrier Program Policy (Attachment 1) and reserved $1,982,000 of 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for the Highway Noise Barrier Program.

Later in November 2001, a call for highway noise barrier project proposals was issued. A five-month call for projects time period was provided to allow local jurisdictions time to hire engineering consultants to assist with the preparation of project proposals. As of the April 25, 2002 deadline, eight project proposals from five jurisdictions totaling nearly $6 million were received.

Recommendation

It is the joint recommendation of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and SANDAG staff that the Transportation Committee recommend to the Board of Directors approval of the proposed list of Highway Noise Barrier projects (Attachment 2, projects ranked 1-3) for fund allocation from the 2002 STIP. SANDAG staff and CTAC also recommend that the Transportation Committee approve the Highway Noise Barrier Program Use-it-or-Lose-it policy outlined below.

Discussion

CTAC consists of engineers and public works directors from each member agency. CTAC reviewed the noise barrier project proposals with SANDAG and Caltrans and unanimously voted to recommend approval of the ranked list of projects shown in Attachment 2. The prioritization criteria in the Board approved policy are based on noise levels, reduction in noise levels (provided by the proposed barrier), benefiting living units, barrier costs, local jurisdiction contribution, and number of residents that predate the freeway.

As shown in Attachment 2, there are three highway noise barrier projects recommended for funding. These three projects are requesting $2,013,000, which is $31,000 over the reserve amount. As proposed, the third project (the City of Oceanside’s Hillside Lane project) would receive $31,000 less funding than the request amount (i.e., $686,000 instead of $717,000). Assuming the Transportation Committee recommends and Board of Directors approves the proposed list, a
funding request would be sent to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for programming the STIP funds.

**Highway Noise Barrier Program Use-it-or-Lose-it Policy**

CTAC recommends a Use-it-or-Lose-it policy for the Highway Noise Barrier Program. The recommended policy requires the project sponsoring agency to: (1) submit quarterly progress reports, (2) hire a consultant for engineering, environmental planning and right-of-way acquisition within six months of the availability of funding, and (3) award a construction contract within two years of the availability of funding.

Project sponsors not meeting the requirements would automatically lose their funding. CTAC will be responsible for keeping the ranked list of projects current for future funding cycles. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to submit future project proposals at any time. CTAC would recommend fund reallocation due to the Use-it-or-Lose-it policy as appropriate.

**Noise Barrier and Noise Reading Inventory**

SANDAG and Caltrans have been working on an inventory of existing highway noise barriers and residential noise readings undertaken by Caltrans. This inventory will assist local jurisdictions in identifying existing noise problem areas and future noise barrier needs. Exhibits will be available to local jurisdictions and from the SANDAG Web Site by August 2002. A geographic information system (GIS) based application will be available to local jurisdictions with the necessary software and data licenses.
1. **Fund Allocation**: SANDAG will allocate up to one percent (1%) of the funds available through the State Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Improvement Program (STIP-RIP) each cycle to fund eligible retrofit noise barriers. Each STIP-RIP cycle, the local jurisdictions are required to submit a request for their candidate retrofit noise barriers to SANDAG for funding consideration. The request must document that at least two-thirds of the residences immediately adjacent to the freeway desire installation of the noise barrier. The local jurisdictions are required to provide all engineering and right of way services, including construction contract administration, unless arrangements are made with Caltrans. The local jurisdictions are required to address long-term noise barrier maintenance issues to the satisfaction of Caltrans prior to funding allocation by SANDAG.

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

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

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

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

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

3. **Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List**: Caltrans will develop and maintain a comprehensive list of noise barrier needs in the region. Caltrans will perform field noise measurements as needed. Caltrans will maintain a two tiered list: Tier one will consist of proposed noise barriers that have a completed Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Tier two will consist of proposed noise barriers that have no NBSSR. Noise barriers in Tier one will be listed in order, based upon their Priority Index numbers. Noise barriers in Tier two will be listed in order, based upon measured noise levels.
4. **Noise Barrier Scope and Summary Report (NBSSR):** The local jurisdictions are responsible for funding and completing the NBSSR. Caltrans is responsible for reviewing and approving the NBSSR. The noise barrier will be advanced from Tier two to Tier one once the NBSSR is approved by Caltrans. Proposed noise barriers must not conflict with projects currently programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Long-term maintenance strategies must be included in the NBSSR. NBSSR guidelines can be found in the Caltrans Design Program Web site at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd. The guidelines are in the Appendix F of the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) that is listed under the Manuals/Guidance/Design Topics heading on the Web site.

5. **Noise Barrier Requests:** Caltrans will investigate all noise barrier requests and maintain a log. The log will be shared with the local jurisdictions and SANDAG on a quarterly basis. The local jurisdictions are responsible to update their contact person information with Caltrans. Caltrans will develop and maintain an educational pamphlet about noise barriers for distribution purposes. If a requested noise barrier does not meet the minimum standards, Caltrans will send the educational pamphlet to the requester.

6. **Priority Index (PI) Calculation:** The PI is used for ranking Tier one noise barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

\[
PI = \frac{(NL-67)^2 \times AR \times LU}{\text{Cost (in $1,000)}}
\]

- **NL:** Is the average of the field-measured noise levels, dBA, Leq(h).
- **AR:** Is the average reduction in noise levels that the proposed noise barrier will achieve. The NAC of 67dBA, Leq(h), is a goal for achievement, but is not mandatory. However, any noise barrier considered under this program must provide a minimum of 5 dBA noise reduction.
- **LU:** Is the number of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway (i.e., first line receivers). Residences located above the first floor in multistory units are included in the living unit count only if the proposed barrier will provide a 5dBA reduction for these units.
- **Cost:** The noise barrier cost in $1,000’s includes all costs directly related to the proposed noise barriers. This includes items for engineering, right of way, earthwork, drainage, traffic control, structure work, planting, and other specialty work, as well as the noise barrier itself.

For projects that include noise barriers at multiple locations, the overall project’s PI is calculated independently for each location. The PI for the combined project is calculated using a weighted average method, with the weighting based on the number of living units at each location.
7. **Priority Index (PI) Adjustment**: A major factor for determining priority is the percentage of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway where occupants have resided there since the time the highway opened. The local jurisdiction in which the residential area is located is responsible for providing documentation on percentage of living units with original occupants still residing immediately adjacent to the highway.

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

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

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

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

8. **Eligible Expenditures**: Only project features directly attributable to a retrofit noise barrier incurred after the noise barrier has been programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) are eligible for funding. Acceptable project features include drainage modification, earthwork, safety treatments, miscellaneous asphalt paving, landscaping, traffic control and right of way acquisition that is directly related to and needed for proper installation of the noise barrier. Support costs (development of final engineering plans, environmental clearance, right of way appraisal, construction management) are eligible for funding. Inappropriate project features include maintenance, upgrades, or enhancements to the adjacent residence or roadway, roadway slopes, or roadway features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Noise Level</th>
<th>Average Reduction</th>
<th>Living Units</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Cumulative Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Percent Residents Predate Freeway</th>
<th>Percent Local Contribution</th>
<th>Adjusted PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Whaley St</td>
<td>California St</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$558</td>
<td>$558</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>Waite Dr</td>
<td>Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$738</td>
<td>$1,296</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Hillside Ln</td>
<td>California St</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$717</td>
<td>$2,013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>$2,899</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR-67</td>
<td>Mollison Ave</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td>$4,608</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>69th St</td>
<td>King St</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$4,913</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>Jill Lane</td>
<td>Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$5,172</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Boundary St</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$765</td>
<td>$5,937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
PI, Priority Index = ("Noise Level" minus 67) squared times "Average Reduction" times "Living Units" divided by "Total Cost"
Adjusted PI = PI plus "Percent Residents that Predate the Freeway" plus "Percent Local Contribution"
Projects #1 through #3 would receive funding from the 2002 STIP funding cycle, and Project #3 would be funded in the amount of $686,000 due to funding constraints.
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of our transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning.

At the May 9, 2002 meeting of the Transportation Committee, SANDAG staff provided an overview of the CMP requirements, focusing on proposed changes contained in the 2002 update. The Transportation Committee requested a comparison of the current CMP approach with changes proposed in the update. This report provides the requested information.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to review and comment on the additional information provided.

Discussion

At the May 9 meeting, the Transportation Committee requested a comparison of the current and proposed approaches to meeting the CMP legislative requirements. This information is provided in the following sections.

Summary of CMP Changes

As required by current law, there are six basic elements that need to be included in a CMP as follows:

- **Roadway Monitoring** - designate a CMP roadway system, establish a level of service standard, and monitor congestion levels against the standard
- **Performance Measures** - establish measures and monitor the performance of the multi-modal transportation system
- **Transportation Demand Management** - establish a transportation demand management program that promotes alternative transportation strategies
- **Land Use Impact Analysis** - establish a program to analyze the impacts of local land use decisions on the regional transportation system
• **Capital Improvement Program** – prepare a capital improvement program to determine effective projects that maintain or improve the performance of the transportation system
• **Deficiency Plan** – evaluate and recommend needed improvements when a roadway segment fails to meet the CMP level of service standard

A comparison of the current CMP approach to meeting these requirements with the changes proposed in the 2002 Update is provided in Attachment 1. The most significant changes proposed in the update deal with:

- Increased emphasis on transportation demand management strategies,
- A goal of 100% new development project mitigation, and
- Increased attention to the development and implementation of deficiency plans for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP level of service standards.

**CMP Working Group**

Assisting SANDAG with the CMP update is a Working Group comprised of representatives from various affected agencies. Existing SANDAG transportation and land use planning technical working groups were asked to nominate representatives to serve on the CMP Working Group with the intent of providing a wide representation of viewpoints and expertise to assist with the CMP update. A full listing of the Working Group roster is provided in Attachment 2.

**CMP Presentations to Date**

To date, presentations regarding the CMP draft proposals have been made to a number of technical working groups and other interested parties. As of May 31, 2002, presentations have been made to:

- CMP Working Group (Monthly)
- City/County Managers Association (3/7/02)
- San Diego Traffic Engineers Council (2/14/02, 3/14/02)
- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (3/18/02)
- 2030 RTP Working Group (3/26/02)
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group (3/28/02)
- SANDAG Transportation Committee (9/13/01, 12/13/01, 5/9/02)
- Caltrans District 11 Planning Division (5/22/02)

In the next two months additional presentations will be scheduled with local jurisdictions, business and professional associations, and environmental and other public interest groups. The intent is to obtain a wide spectrum of review and comment on the CMP proposals.
## Attachment 1
### Comparison of Current and Proposed 2002 CMP Update Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every two years the CMP roadway system is monitored against the CMP Level of</td>
<td>No change in general approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (LOS) standard “E.” Road segments that do not meet the standard must</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergo a Deficiency Plan analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial action is required only when roadway segment exceeds LOS standard.</td>
<td>SANDAG will notify agencies when trends indicate that a roadway may not meet the</td>
<td>The guidelines are voluntary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS standard in the future. Notified agencies may elect to take proactive actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to address the potential congestion problems. Guidelines to address the potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problem are proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CMP roadway system is to include all state highways and principal arterial.</td>
<td>Clarification of the criteria for identifying CMP arterials is provided. Routes</td>
<td>The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan update will evaluate potential CMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that meet a majority of the regional arterial system criteria, serve longer trips,</td>
<td>arterial candidates as part of the effort to identify “regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and provide connectivity to other CMP routes will be evaluated as potential CMP</td>
<td>significant” arterials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arterial candidates that may be added to the CMP system in future updates or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amendments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor transit performance by MTDB and NCTD sub-areas.</td>
<td>Monitor transit performance by major CMP transit corridors.</td>
<td>Will require future definition of CMP transit corridors and assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of individual routes to each corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing transit performance measures are service frequency, routing, and fares,</td>
<td>Replace service frequency measure with measures that identify service levels</td>
<td>This type of data is already collected by the transit agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination, and transfers.</td>
<td>(trips or headways), travel speed (speed or travel time), and service use (</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ridership). Data for these measures will be evaluated by major CMP transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New multi-modal performance measures: travel time (by mode), air quality</td>
<td>This type of data is already collected by SANDAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emissions, vehicle miles traveled, and changes in mode share.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of Current and Proposed Key CMP Feature Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement and monitor TDM program, RideLink, and support efforts in development and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transit Vision.</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and support RideLink, Regional Comprehensive Plan, and Regional Transit Vision efforts and suggest changes as needed to support CMP objectives.</td>
<td>Future effort included in SANDAG FY 2003 Overall Work Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperation with local agencies, develop a model TDM program/ordinance for local agency consideration and use. Consider giving funding priority to jurisdictions that adopt a TDM program or ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop “Toolbox of Mitigation Strategies” for local agency use in mitigating new development, preparing Deficiency Plans, and in support of other local programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future effort included in SANDAG FY 2003 Overall Work Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Impact Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced CEQA project review required for projects generating 2,400 or more daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak-hour vehicle trips. Review to identify impacts of project on the CMP system and if there are significant impacts, identify project mitigation.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of project mitigation varies by project and jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Proposed goal of 100% project mitigation either through implementation of project specific mitigation measures or implementing Deficiency Plan recommendations. Increased SANDAG monitoring of project mitigation.</td>
<td>Approval of project mitigation will remain with CEQA identified “responsible agency”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of Current and Proposed Key CMP Feature Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Program (CIP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) serves as CMP Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td>RTIP to continue serving as CMP CIP. Update proposes funding priority for projects in support of CMP and/or projects that implement Deficiency Plan recommendations.</td>
<td>Existing SANDAG project prioritization criteria to be reviewed in light of proposed CMP priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiency Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local agencies are to take the initiative and prepare Deficiency Plans when a roadway segment exceeds the CMP standard of LOS “E”.</td>
<td>SANDAG to formally notify local agencies when deficiency plans are required and to more closely monitor plan development.</td>
<td>Formal letters to be sent out after each CMP update is adopted by the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency Plan guidance provided primarily for state freeways.</td>
<td>Guidelines expanded to include CMP arterials and to provide more guidance on preparation responsibilities, plan content and evaluation, and schedule.</td>
<td>CMP workshop to be held after the 2002 CMP update is adopted explaining all CMP requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (CMP Conformance)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) self-certification check list process, local agencies are to certify conformance with CMP. RGMS being replaced by Regional Comprehensive Plan (in development), and check list is no longer being used.</td>
<td>Local agencies to biennially adopt resolutions certifying they: 1) are providing biennial roadway monitoring data; 2) are implementing the Land Use Analysis Program; and 3) will prepare Deficiency Plans when required. SANDAG to make formal certification finding with each CMP update.</td>
<td>Draft CMP provides sample certification resolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 2
### CMP Working Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>SANDAG Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Baza</td>
<td>Chief, Transportation Planning Branch</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conan Cheung</td>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Development Board</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niall Fritz</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Regional Planning Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Goralka</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>Deputy City Engineer</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>San Diego Traffic Engineers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Leiter</td>
<td>Director of Planning and Building</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Regional Planning Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Marks</td>
<td>Manager of Service Development</td>
<td>North San Diego County Transit District</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siavash Pazargadi</td>
<td>Senior Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego Traffic Engineers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Schuler</td>
<td>Director of Engineering</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRAL INTERSTATE 5 CORRIDOR STUDY – STATUS REPORT

Introduction

In response to increasing traffic demands on Interstate 5 in the San Diego Centre City area, SANDAG, in partnership with Caltrans, the City of San Diego and the San Diego Unified Port District is conducting the Central I-5 Corridor Study. The study area extends from Sea World Drive to State Route 54 in the south, and from the coast eastward to Interstate 805. The focus of the study is on potential solutions for access to and from Interstate 5, along with improved north-south mobility through the entire corridor. This planning-level study is intended to provide the blueprint for future access and mainlane improvements related to I-5 in the Centre City area.

Initially, two individual studies were evaluating better freeway access to the airport and the Port of San Diego marine terminals. Combined into a comprehensive evaluation of the whole Central I-5 corridor, the study is examining the short-term and long-term freeway, arterial and transit needs in view of the various master plans and proposed projects in the area. Initial analysis of several alternatives has been completed, and a plan of preferred improvement components will be presented to the Transportation Committee early this fall.

Discussion

The economic boom of the late 1990s has brought a resurgence of growth to Centre City. At the same time, new master plans have been developed for Lindbergh Field north of downtown, and for the commercial marine terminals to the south. Other recent or in-progress developments in the area include expansion of the Convention Center, reuse of the Naval Training Center, the North Embarcadero Plan, the Ballpark, and numerous housing developments in downtown San Diego.

Past traffic studies for individual projects have not reflected the cumulative impacts on access to, from and through the Centre City area. For example, the Supplemental EIR for the Ballpark and Ancillary Development Projects references the preparation of a Freeway Deficiency Plan with as yet unnamed improvements. The goal of the Deficiency Plan, now enfolded into the overall Central I-5 Corridor Study, is to identify near-term and long-term capacity improvements and programs for the freeway system serving Centre City. Better vehicle and bus access into the Old Town Transit Center also were added to the study objectives.

Guided by a Policy Advisory Committee of elected officials and high-level representatives from participating agencies, staff and the consultant team recently tested three major improvement concepts for the corridor. These were focused on transit/Transportation Demand Management (TDM), parallel arterials, and freeway enhancements. All of the concepts included preferred access
options into the airport, marine terminals and the Old Town Transit Center, analyzed in the first phase of the corridor study. The results of these concepts were presented to the Central I-5 Policy Committee at its April 22, 2002 meeting.

Further analysis will bring the positive aspects of each concept plan together to assess overall corridor mobility. Refinement of the various components will include planning-level cost estimates and phasing plans. Recommendations to the Central I-5 Policy Advisory Committee and a draft report are scheduled by the end of the summer 2002. These recommendations will be presented at a future Transportation Committee meeting for possible inclusion in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

Attachment 1 is a simplified map of the Central I-5 Corridor study area. Attachment 2 highlights the key findings and conclusions from the analysis of improvement concepts conducted to date. Staff will summarize the major aspects of the each of these concepts at the Transportation Committee meeting.
The attachment to this document can be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
## Central I-5 Corridor Study
### Alternative Corridor Improvement Concepts
#### Draft (April 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Concept</th>
<th>Key Findings/Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Airport Access Improvements | • Significantly improves access to both north and south terminals.  
• Removes railroad at-grade-crossing conflicts.  
• Reduces traffic volumes on surrounding surface streets.  
• Improves LOS at number of nearby intersections.  
• Harbor/Laurel intersection would require grade-separation. |
| 10th Avenue Marine Terminal Access Improvements | • Significantly improves access to terminal facilities.  
• Reduces traffic volumes on surface streets surrounding the terminal.  
• Reduces traffic volumes on streets through nearby neighborhoods.  
• Eliminates delays at trolley crossings. |
| National City Marine Terminal Access Improvements | • Improves access to/from the terminal facilities.  
• Projected traffic volumes well within capacity of improved Civic Center Drive and Bay Marina Drive.  
• Interchange ramp intersections projected to operate at acceptable LOS.  
• Geometric improvements required to handle volume of truck activity. |
| Old Town Transit Center Access Improvements | • HOV lanes along Pacific Highway (to/from the north) connecting with future I-5 HOV lanes.  
• Dedicated bus lanes along Pacific Highway/Laurel/Harbor from Transit Center to Airport.  
• Potential slip ramp to Rosecrans from WB I-8 to SB I-5 freeway-to-freeway connector. |
| Transit | • Demonstrated reduction in corridor roadway travel demands.  
• RTV/Transit First have potential to be key part of comprehensive corridor improvement program.  
• Potential for significant gains in transit ridership tempered by already extensive corridor transit services.  
• Does not eliminate need for corridor freeway improvements. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Concept</th>
<th>Key Findings/Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Parallel Arterials**                      | • Increases efficiency of corridor’s surface street system.  
• Minor shifts in volumes from I-5 freeway to parallel arterials (1%).  
• Provides alternative routings in case of freeway incidences and/or significant congestion.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| **Freeway Enhancement: Centre City Collector – Distributor System** | • Modifies Centre City freeway access points.  
• Provides interconnected system of freeway access ramps serving Centre City.  
• Provides additional parallel roadway capacity through the Centre City “S Curve”.  
• Projected to carry greater than an equivalent freeway lane of volumes in each direction (+2400 peak hour volumes).  
• Eliminate use of I-5 freeway for short trips.  
• Removes critical weave movements from freeway.  
• Provides additional freeway-to-freeway connections.  
• Minimizes spillback of traffic queues onto the downtown grid from metered freeway on-ramps.                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| **Freeway Enhancement: I-5 Ramp Modifications** | • Increases interchange/ramp capacities.  
• Improves ramp geometry and merge/diverge traffic conflicts.  
• Facilities better utilization of freeway mainline.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| **Freeway Enhancement: New Freeway-to-Freeway Connectors** | • Low to moderate utilization of new freeway-to-freeway connectors.  
• Improves distribution of trips among corridor freeway facilities.  
• Reduces out-of-direction travel and provides travel time savings for select trips.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Freeway Enhancement: I-5 Freeway Widenings/Auxiliary Lanes** | • Projected demands require widening where physically possible to provide added capacity.  
• Additional auxiliary lanes to facilitate merge and diverge movements at freeway ramps.  
• Consider additional widenings south of I-15 interchange.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| **Other Corridor Freeway Improvements**     | • Added I-805 capacity provides moderate reduction in I-5 freeway demands.  
• Encourage use of I-5 to I-15 to I-805 for through corridor trips.  
• System-wide enhancements necessary – otherwise tend to just relocate bottlenecks.                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |