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MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, October 6, 2006

ITEM #

+1. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 1, 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 4)

+3. APPOINTMENT TO SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (Danielle Kochman)

SANDAG recently established the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) to advise SANDAG on transportation issues for seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of limited means. One of the SSTAC membership positions has been recently vacated. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the appointment of Mr. Bob Prath to SSTAC as the representative of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older.

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

This report summarizes the results of SANDAG’s efforts to coordinate transit and land use through the project development review process during the period January through June 2006. 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 approximately $531,600 in privately funded transit and pedestrian facilities.

REPORTS (5 through 10)

+5. FY 2008 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND CRITERIA (Ellen Roundtree)

Each year, SANDAG provides our Congressional delegation with the region’s list of high priority transportation projects for consideration during the annual appropriations process. The FY 2008 federal appropriations process is expected to begin in early February 2007. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve criteria for selecting projects for the FY 2008 federal transportation appropriations cycle.
+6. **I-15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT OPERATIONS CONCEPT** (Linda Culp)  

The Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes are scheduled to open in phases beginning in 2008. The TransNet Early Action Program also calls for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service between Escondido and downtown San Diego via I-15 and State Route 94. SANDAG, North County Transit District, and Metropolitan Transit System have developed an operations plan that takes advantage of the infrastructure as it opens, first by serving new stations with existing commuter express services in 2008 and ultimately with full BRT service in 2012, when all three Managed Lanes segments are completed. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the initial operations concept for I-15 BRT service.

+7. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO FasTrak™ PROGRAM AND AMENDED AND RESTATED MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH MTS FOR I-15 TRANSIT SERVICES** (Linda Culp)  

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve Resolution No. 2007-08, concerning the updated FasTrak Value Pricing Policy for the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor; and (2) authorize the Executive Director to execute an Amended and Restated Memorandum of Understanding and Fund Transfer Agreement with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), in substantially the same form as attached, to continue to provide I-15 FasTrak funding to support I-15 corridor transit services beginning in FY 2007.

+8. **FY 2006 JOBS ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE/NEW FREEDOM FUNDING PROCESS** (Dan Levy)  

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) extended the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funding program and created a new funding program called New Freedom. SANDAG is the designated recipient of these funds for the San Diego region. SAFETEA-LU also created a new requirement that the designated recipient must develop and manage an annual competitive process to allocate the funding to eligible agencies. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the criteria for allocating JARC and New Freedom grant funding for FY 2006. If approved, the competitive process for the FY 2006 JARC funding would begin in the fall.

+9. **TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET TRANSFERS** (John Haggerty)  

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the transfer of $232,840 in funds from six transit Capital Improvement Program projects in order to fund the installation of closed-circuit television surveillance equipment at three Metropolitan Transit System trolley stations in Chula Vista.
In December 2005, SANDAG, in partnership with the California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, and California Highway Patrol, implemented a one-year demonstration project along the Interstate 805/State Route 52 corridor between Kearny Mesa and University Towne Centre to evaluate the effectiveness of using the freeway shoulder lanes as a transit priority measure. This report highlights the results of the demonstration project based on the project's key issues areas: safety, bus travel time/reliability, bus driver and passenger perceptions, freeway maintenance, and shoulder structural changes.

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, October 20, 2006, at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2006

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:00 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Jerome Stocks (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the August 4, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Jim Schmidt, a member of the public, spoke in favor of Proposition 1A. He also added that state gas tax funds should not be borrowed for nontransportation purposes.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, stated that he did not support a new stadium for the Chargers.

Councilmember Madaffer asked Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) for a status of trolley operations for the San Diego State University (SDSU) Aztec games. Mr. Jablonski said he did not receive any reports of unusual activity at the Thursday night Aztec game. MTS partnered with the House of Blues on a promotion to provide 5,000 trolley passes to the game; this was one reason for the high ridership last night. Mr. Jablonski added that during the first week of classes, ridership on the Green Line Trolley also was significantly higher than the same time last year.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 and 4)

Chair Kellejian noted that Item No. 3 was pulled from the Consent Agenda due to a request by a member of the public. He asked for action on Consent Item No. 4.
4. SEPTEMBER 2006 MTS TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES (INFORMATION)

MTS and NCTD implement changes to bus, trolley, and COASTER service at various times throughout the year to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transit service in the region. Last June, MTS began phased implementation of its Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA). In September, MTS will implement the next phase of service changes resulting from the COA. This report provides the Transportation Committee with information on the upcoming MTS transit service changes.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 4.

3. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM (ACCEPT)

Chair Kellejian recognized Mr. Lungerhausen to comment on this item.

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, said that he is supportive of the transit system, including the recent improvements to convert to a low-floor system where people just walk on the bus or trolley. He stated that he did not support bus rapid transit (BRT) taking the place of trolley service in the Mid-Coast Corridor.

Chair Kellejian reported that staff has developed an integrated public involvement program to reach out to nontraditional and traditional audiences to raise their awareness of the transportation planning process and specific SANDAG programs and projects. Early public involvement and comment about the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is an important part of developing a transportation public policy blueprint that helps meet the travel needs of our residents. A draft public involvement program has been prepared, and the Transportation Committee is being asked to accept the draft for distribution and a 45-day public comment period.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) supported this action. He asked if the primary reason for this program is to raise awareness and buy-in from the public into the current projects in our RTP. He also wondered if we will make changes to the RTP as a result of this public involvement strategy. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, said that the RTP is updated every three years. We strive to get as much public involvement as possible during each update. Sometimes we get ideas from the public that we hadn’t thought about before. The SANDAG Board of Directors and Transportation Committee can then weigh the public input received during policy decisions on the RTP.

Chair Kellejian noted that the full SANDAG Board will hear this item at its October 27, 2006, meeting.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) said that he would like to see the proposed costs for the program included in any future staff report. Mr. Gallegos stated that the funding for the public involvement program is included as part of the RTP budget. Anne Steinberger, Acting Communications Director, said that she will make sure the costs are included in the next reports to the Transportation Committee and Board.
Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee accepted the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Public Involvement Program for distribution and a 45-day public comment period.

REPORTS (5 through 7)

5. DRAFT NEXUS STUDY FOR TransNet REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, stated that in November 2004 San Diego County voters approved Proposition A extending the TransNet half-cent sales tax for transportation through 2048. Included in this TransNet Ordinance is the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP). The purpose of this program is to ensure that new development directly invests in the regional transportation system to offset the negative impacts of growth on congestion and mobility. The RTCIP provides for the collection of a fee for each new dwelling unit to ensure future development contributes its proportional share of the funding needed to pay for the Regional Arterial System (RAS) and related transportation facility improvements, as defined in SANDAG’s most recently adopted RTP. One of the requirements of the TransNet Ordinance is for SANDAG to produce an RTCIP Nexus Study to help satisfy the legal requirements governing development impact fees in California. Cities and counties have the authority to impose impact fees under the state Mitigation Fee Act; however, in doing so, each local jurisdiction is required to make findings demonstrating a reasonable nexus between the collection of fees, the need for facilities created by new development, and the expenditure of fee revenues to benefit new development.

The purpose of this study is to provide a single Nexus Study that all local agencies in the San Diego region can use as a basis for adopting a funding program that could be used to fulfill their contribution to the RTCIP. The nexus analysis demonstrates that an average impact fee of $2,071 per new residential unit is allowed under the California Mitigation Fee Act. Each local agency that wants to impose a development impact fee on the basis of this Nexus Study will need to verify the findings in the study before adopting those findings for the particular local agency’s use in imposing a fee. The RTCIP is the first time a regionwide development impact fee has been recommended for regional facilities. As an update to the RTP, we will explore other fees that may be necessary to close the funding gap for necessary regional transportation projects.

Mr. Cox noted that MuniFinancial and Cambridge Systematics conducted the Nexus Study. He introduced Robert Spencer with MuniFinancial to provide a report.

Mr. Spencer stated that he will cover what the RTCIP does, the analysis approach and results, and comments on implementation. The Nexus Study was mandated by the TransNet Extension. Later in September, the SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to accept the study, and then it will go out to local agencies that will need to adopt the funding program required by the TransNet Extension. Key components of the RTCIP are: beginning on July 1, 2008, local agencies must have a funding program in place to generate an average of $2,071 per new residential unit; the sources of funding are not specified other than
“exactions from the private sector;” local agencies keep and expend these revenues independently, subject to RTCIP requirements; revenues must be invested in the Regional Arterial System and consistent with the most recently adopted RTP; the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is responsible for monitoring local agency participation in the RTCIP; and failure to participate in this program could result in the loss of TransNet sales tax funding for local roads. He showed a map of the Regional Arterial System.

Mr. Spencer reviewed what the Nexus Study provides to local agencies, including relief from having to conduct an individual nexus study to adopt and implement the RTCIP, a defensible nexus analysis, a summary of typical statutory findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act, and a fee schedule for residential development.

Mr. Spencer stated that the nexus analysis approach was to determine growth projections, identify facility standards, determine what facility costs should be allocated to new growth, then determine the amount and cost of facilities needed to accommodate that growth. The methodology results in recommended fees of $2,331 for a single-family home, $1,865 for a multi-family home, and $1,166 for a mobile home. The average fee for residential unit is $2,071. The fees will need to be adjusted annually to account for inflation. If a local jurisdiction opts to use a different residential fee schedule, then it must prepare its own nexus study in order to adopt the required RTCIP funding program. Adoption of a nonresidential fee is not required for the RTCIP.

Mr. Spencer said that regarding collection and administration, there will be an annual review by the ITOC using the same reports that local agencies must prepare under the Mitigation Fee Act. The RTCIP allows for up to a 1 percent program administration charge for SANDAG, on top of the impact fee. The local agencies will be required to collect the fee at the building permit stage, maintain the funds in a separate account, credit the interest earned on fund balances, expend the fees on allowable projects, and submit an annual report to the ITOC. An additional 2 percent administrative charge for local agencies also is allowable under the RTCIP. Mr. Spencer reviewed the allowable expenditures and fee exemptions.

Sandy Shapery, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Vice Chair, asked why there was such a difference in the fee per square foot between industrial uses and office services uses. Mr. Spencer said that there are two things going on: the trip rates and commercial reallocation. The trip rates for industrial areas are much lower than for office services uses. In addition, a portion of commercial impacts (from local-serving commercial uses) were reallocated to residential uses. The combination of the differing trip rates and the commercial reallocation results in higher fees per square foot of office services.

Councilmember Monroe said that the City of Coronado does not have a regional arterial on the map. Mr. Cox said that State Route 75 was added to the list of eligible improvements, even though it is not technically part of the Regional Arterial System.

Councilmember Monroe said that State Route 282 should be included as well. Mr. Gallegos said that as part of the RTP update, SANDAG will work with all of the jurisdictions to
determine whether new segments should be added to the adopted RAS. He noted that Coronado can request the addition of State Route 282 during the 2007 RTP update process.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, said there could be a time lag between when sufficient funds for RAS improvements are available and when these improvements are actually needed. He asked whether jurisdictions could borrow against future revenues to implement projects sooner. Mr. Gallegos said that some jurisdictions such as the City of Chula Vista already have programs in place to build facilities when they are needed.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there is anything in the Ordinance language that would prevent charging a fee for nonresidential units. Mr. Spencer replied that the Ordinance doesn’t disallow it; it just doesn’t require a fee on nonresidential units.

Councilmember Madaffer asked how the average amount of $2,071 per new residential unit was reached. It seems convenient that it matches the estimated amount in the TransNet Extension. Mr. Cox said different methodological approaches were used to estimate the average fee. SANDAG used a traditional methodology and came up with $1,850 per new unit, which was rounded up to an even $2,000. The consultant’s methodology differed from our original methodology; it relates the fee to total trips. However, the resulting average fee of $2,071 per residential unit is similar to the original estimate.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the fee revenues are subject to the same ITOC audit as required for other TransNet funds. Mr. Spencer responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Madaffer asked whether local jurisdictions are required both to adopt a fee program and to expend the funds on RAS improvements. Mr. Cox said that both are required in order for a local agency to receive its share of TransNet local street and road funds.

Councilmember Madaffer asked when this fee on building permits for residential construction would be effective. Mr. Cox said that it begins when the current TransNet measure ends, on July 1, 2008. There are some jurisdictions in the region that already charge a fee today and use the money to improve the RAS. If a jurisdiction already is charging this kind of a fee and dedicating it for RAS improvements in their jurisdiction, then it would not be required to charge another fee on top of the existing one.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if a local jurisdiction would need an analysis to determine whether the requirement for a new fee program could be waived. Mr. Cox stated that the ITOC would be responsible for determining whether the RTCIP requirements were being met and whether a waiver would be appropriate.

Chair Kellejian clarified that if a jurisdiction is collecting an average of $1,800 per residential unit, it would have to start charging an additional $271 on the new date, not $2,071 on top of the current $1,800 amount.

Mr. Gallegos said that the fee has to be tied to a nexus study. Local agencies can use this Nexus Study or conduct their own nexus study.
Councilmember Madaffer said that this study recommends exemption of affordable housing and sanctuaries. The City of San Diego charges impact fees for those types of uses. Mr. Cox said that when we originally put this program together, it was the Board’s wish at that time to exempt low-income housing. Each jurisdiction can opt to conduct its own nexus study, and can require a fee for certain residential uses excluded by this Nexus Study.

Mr. Spencer noted that you cannot adopt more than the average $2,071 amount as adjusted for inflation.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the City of San Diego has been collecting fees for transportation facilities that haven’t been built yet. He asked whether the City of San Diego would get credit for these existing fee programs. Mr. Spencer said that the RTCIP update applies to all building permits pulled after July 1, 2008.

Councilmember Madaffer noted that there is a lot of technical information in the Nexus Study that is important for jurisdictions to know.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if some of the funds can be used outside of the area collected. He stated that the City of San Diego has a practice of using impact fees only in the community in which they are collected. Mr. Spencer replied that the RTCIP requires fees to be spent within the jurisdictions in which they are collected, but it does not exclude neighboring jurisdictions from pooling their funds for projects that affect multiple jurisdictions.

Mr. Gallegos said that the TransNet Ordinance states that the fee is to be collected and held by local jurisdictions; however, if the money is not used by a certain time, then SANDAG will be entitled to use the funding for other regional purposes. If SANDAG doesn’t use the funds for regional purposes, the funds are to be returned to the developers.

Mr. Spencer added that if you hold the money for more than seven years, you have to explain the reason for continuing to hold it.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the ITOC needs to validate the amount of the administrative fees that are collected for administering the impact fee programs. He thought that the administrative fees should be justified. Mr. Spencer stated that the administrative charge has to be reasonable.

Chair Kellejian said that the ITOC would review the administrative fee on an annual basis. Mr. Gallegos added that these administrative fees would be subject to an audit as all of the other TransNet funding programs.

Councilmember Madaffer suggested that perhaps language should be included to clarify this. Mr. Spencer agreed to add language in the Nexus Study to clarify the purpose and allowable amount of the administrative fees.

Chair Kellejian agreed that we should include that comment in the report to the SANDAG Board.
Supervisor Horn said that history has shown that the money collected sits there for some time before it is spent on projects. He has a hard time with SANDAG adding a 1 percent administrative charge and having that continue to build. He said that the developers don’t get the benefit of the interest this money earns.

Supervisor Roberts asked if facilities like hospitals are included. Mr. Cox said that hospitals were nonresidential uses, which are required under the RTCIP. The required funding program is for residential units only and specifically to fund the RAS. The data included in the Nexus Study for industrial and commercial development is only for information.

Supervisor Roberts stated that he does not understand why we are excluding nonresidential uses since they also are all adding trips to the RAS. Mr. Spencer stated that the Nexus Study looked at every trip generated, both for residential and nonresidential uses. The RTCIP only requires a funding program for residential uses. It is up to local jurisdictions whether to collect from nonresidential development.

Mr. Gallegos noted that when we did develop the TransNet Extension there was a debate on this issue and it was decided that the fee would only be required for residential units; however, it is up to each local jurisdiction.

Supervisor Roberts asked Mr. Spencer to review the trip ends. Mr. Spencer referred to Table 3 on page 10 of the report and reviewed the factors used to obtain the results.

Supervisor Roberts asked if there is a breakdown among different types of commercial uses, for example between a large shopping center and a smaller “7/11” commercial development. Mr. Spencer said that the commercial rate in the table is an average rate across all commercial land uses. Supervisor Roberts stated that this is not necessarily fair.

Chair Kellejian indicated that there was one request to speak on this item.

Matt Adams, representing the Building Industry Association (BIA), said that they would like an opportunity to meet with Marney Cox and his team in order to better understand the Nexus Study results.

Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Coastal) stated that he enjoyed this study, and felt that it should eventually be accepted by the Board. He stated that the City of Del Mar is not going to collect a lot of money under this program because it won’t be building a whole lot of new housing. However, traffic in Del Mar is affected by surrounding communities, such as Torrey Pines Mesa and Carmel Valley. He recommended that the fee program be structured so that revenues could be used to mitigate impacts in adjoining cities.

Chair Kellejian expressed surprise that Del Mar did not include Camino Del Mar in the RAS. Councilmember Druker responded that money will not solve the traffic problem on Camino Del Mar. The number of vehicles using this arterial segment through Del Mar exceeds vehicles on any other segment of Highway 101. We need to have adjoining areas work together to solve these problems.
First Vice Chair Mary Sessom commented that this Nexus Study doesn’t change anything; jurisdictions have always had to deal with impacts caused by development in adjoining communities. She expressed concern about using these funds for unintended purposes. This money is to mitigate impacts from new residential development on the RAS. She stated that she did not support an expansion of what is included in the TransNet Ordinance.

Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) said that he is struggling with requiring a fee for residential but not requiring one for nonresidential units.

Chair Kellejian pointed out that the original ad hoc committee on TransNet had a number of discussions about this very issue. He thought the reason not to include nonresidential development was because you would be double-charging. Mr. Gallegos said that the key point here is a funding program to pay for the impacts of new residential development on the RAS. This is the minimum needed for local agencies to comply with the TransNet Ordinance. However, local jurisdictions can broaden the scope of their funding program to include nonresidential units if desired.

Councilmember Stocks stated that we are not going to resolve the differences between the jurisdictions today. Encinitas is surrounded by jurisdictions building new residential developments. We are not an island. We need to try and improve the traffic flow and quality of life as best we can. Today’s issue is adopting a nexus study, not rearguing whether to apply a fee to nonresidential development.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) said that this study does not preclude a local government agency from charging a fee for commercial units.

Councilmember Monroe said that California is a state that is not perceived as business friendly, and there is a huge movement within the state to try and change this perception. This was one of the original reasons for excluding nonresidential development from the required RTCIP funding program.

Councilmember Dale stated that California also is a state in need of affordable housing. Transportation is huge to this region and we are continually faced with identifying sources of revenue to help fund transportation improvements.

First Vice Chair Sessom asked if the TransNet Ordinance precludes a jurisdiction from charging a fee for industrial development. Mr. Cox responded that local government agencies are responsible for determining the type of funding program, so long as the money comes from private sources.

Mr. Cox responded to an earlier comment made by Supervisor Horn. He stated that the reason for the interest charge on development impact fees is to offset the impacts of inflation. Project costs will typically rise over time.

Mr. Cox also clarified that the fees collected may be spent on RAS improvements in other jurisdictions. He also referred to Page 23 of the report under Collection and Administration, and pointed out the last two sentences related to the purpose of the administrative fees. He offered to make this language stronger.
Supervisor Roberts noted that an environmental assessment is typically required for any major commercial project; that is when there will be an opportunity to exact fees or improvements to mitigate any impacts. He noted that therefore he was okay with not applying an across-the-board fee for nonresidential uses as part of this RTCIP.

Councilmember Madaffer stated there needs to be justification for charging administrative fees. Staff should note the comments made by this Committee and make changes to the Nexus Study and staff report to the Board accordingly.

Chair Kellejian reiterated that administrative fee charges will be reviewed as part of the ITOC’s annual review.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the Nexus Study for the purpose of distributing it to the local jurisdictions for their use in implementing the funding program required by the TransNet Ordinance.

6. CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET TRANSFERS (APPROVE)

Chair Kellejian stated that staff has pulled this item as the cumulative amount of the recommended budget transfers is over the Transportation Committee’s $500,000 approval threshold. This item will go to the Board of Directors for approval.

7. CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9 - CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION FOR ONE POTENTIAL CASE

Chair Kellejian convened the Transportation Committee into closed session at 10:21 a.m. and reconvened the meeting into open session at 10:31 a.m.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel, reported the following out of closed session: the Transportation Committee met in closed session and unanimously voted to execute a contract change order with Benold Construction Company, Inc., for the settlement of claims.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

Chair Kellejian noted that the meeting scheduled for Friday, September 15, 2006, has been cancelled. The next Transportation Committee meeting would be held on October 6.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:33 a.m.
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<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Norine Sigafoose</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor’s Appointee</td>
<td>Xema Jacobson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Sandor Shapery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPPOINTMENT TO SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL  File Number 3001100

Introduction

On August 4, 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the creation of a new Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) to replace the Subcommittee on Accessible Transit (SCAT). This action was taken in order to improve compliance with the Public Utilities Code, by fulfilling the membership, representation, and organizational requirements set forth in the code. Action also was taken to approve the SSTAC membership structure and initial members and to recognize the Transportation Committee’s authority to appoint all future members of SSTAC consistent with the membership structure.

Discussion

Andre Tueben, the citizen selected to fill the seat for potential transit users age 60 or older, is no longer able to attend meetings, and has resigned his position. Mr. Bob Prath has been recommended by current SSTAC members, Floyd Willis, from San Diego County Aging and Independent Services, and Alane Haynes, from the North County Transit District, to fill the position being vacated. Mr. Prath is active in senior affairs in San Diego and participates in the American Association of Retired Persons and the East County Action Network (ECAN). The proposed revised membership structure for SSTAC is shown in the table below, with the recommended new member in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One representative of potential transit users who is 60 years of age or older.</td>
<td>Bob Prath</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One representative of potential transit users who is a person with a disability.</td>
<td>Chuck Lungerhausen</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two representatives of the local social service providers for seniors, including one representative of a social service transportation provider, if one exists.</td>
<td>County of San Diego, Aging and Independent Services Adult Protective Services, Inc. (transportation provider)</td>
<td>2 Years 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two representatives of local social service providers for persons with disabilities, including one representative of a social service transportation provider, if one exists.</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Center Center for the Blind (transportation provider)</td>
<td>2 Years 3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One representative of local social service providers for persons of limited means.</td>
<td>All Congregations Together</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two representatives from the local Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA), designated pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 15975 of the Government Code, if one exists, including one representative from a transportation service provider, if one exists. One CTSA member shall represent the North County Transit District (NCTD) service area and the other CTSA member shall represent the Metropolitan Transit System service area.</td>
<td>Full Access &amp; Coordinated Transportation Full Access &amp; Coordinated Transportation</td>
<td>3 Years 1 Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, dko@sandag.org
BIANNUAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REPORT

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.

SANDAG is responsible for working with local jurisdictions and other agencies to coordinate land use and transit planning. 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 January 2006 through June 2006. 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.

Discussion

SANDAG staff reviewed a total of 295 development projects from local jurisdictions and other agencies in San Diego County during the first half of calendar year 2006. By submitting comments through each agency’s development review process, we worked with local jurisdictions to incorporate transit facilities and transit-supportive designs into 41 projects which resulted in 149 improvements. The remaining 254 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
FOR JANUARY 2006 THROUGH JUNE 2006

<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>27</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connections and Accessibility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bus Stops and Passenger Landings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Benches</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Shelters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Turnouts/In-Street Concrete Pad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Lights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>$531,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 $531,600.

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

The trend that began in 2005, where the balance in the number of project improvements shifted from the central and southern subregions serviced by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), toward the northern subregion serviced by North County Transit District (NCTD), continues into the first half of 2006. 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.

Further, with respect to bus shelters, MTS has an arrangement with a private vendor that provides shelters in exchange for advertising and therefore typically does not request new bus shelters as part of the development review process. Conversely, bus shelters in the NCTD service area are not subsidized through advertising and are therefore requested as part of the development improvements.

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 region-wide 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
## Development Projects Contributing Transit-Related Improvements for January - June 2006

<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>
<th>Bike Parking (# of racks)</th>
<th>Solar Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Raceway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad Water Desalination Plant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails End</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alga Norte Community Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon View</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-Miller Project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Square Condominiums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash-Lerner-Vista Sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Vulcan/Ashbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150 Melba Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Condominiums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanview Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Ranch Lot 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Terrace Professional Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraza at Rancho del Oro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Alta Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Linda Paseo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Mixed Use Vesting TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door of Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University Kearny Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens at Utopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Square Condominiums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View Terrace Professional Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraza at Rancho del Oro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Alta Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Pointe Corporate Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Plaza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Farms Assisted Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowridge Business Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbit Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Kidney Dialysis Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Arcadia Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Oak Villas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375 Vista Grande Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$5,000</th>
<th>$10,000</th>
<th>$5,000</th>
<th>$1,000</th>
<th>$8,000</th>
<th>$750</th>
<th>$25,000</th>
<th>$400</th>
<th>$2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Value</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $531,600
FY 2008 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND CRITERIA

Introduction

Each year, SANDAG approves a list of transportation projects to submit to our Congressional delegation for funding consideration during the annual federal appropriations process. The FY 2008 transportation appropriations process is expected to begin in early February 2007. In order to provide our delegation with the San Diego region’s proposals for the FY 2008 funding cycle, SANDAG should develop a list of transportation projects by January 2007.

Last year, the Transportation Committee approved criteria for selecting transportation projects for the FY 2007 federal appropriations cycle. The Committee recognized that Congress was facing many competing funding needs and that transportation appropriation levels were expected to be much lower than prior years. Funding for discretionary transportation projects is again expected to be limited this year. Congress also is expected to scrutinize projects more closely and favor funding those that have been through a regional process.

Discussion

FY 2007 Selection Process and Criteria

In December 2005, the Transportation Committee approved a process for selecting local transportation projects for the FY 2007 federal appropriations funding cycle. Projects were first required to be in MOBILITY 2030, the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), in order to qualify for potential funding. If the project was in the adopted RTP, then it was evaluated using the following six criteria. Projects that met a greater number of these criteria were added to the comprehensive list of proposed projects for the FY 2007 transportation appropriations cycle (Attachment 1) and were submitted to our Congressional delegation in February/March 2006. Requests for FY 2007 totaled approximately $208 million.

- Projects that are in construction and require additional funding
- Projects that are “ready to go” to construction
• Projects that have significant local funding identified
• Projects that are environmentally cleared
• Projects that improve security and safety in the region
• Projects that protect the region’s investment in infrastructure, including rolling stock

As anticipated, discretionary projects in the FY 2007 federal transportation appropriations bill were reduced significantly from prior years. Total discretionary projects in the FY 2007 transportation appropriations bill are down about 70 percent compared to FY 2006. While still pending final approval, the San Diego regional transportation projects included in the FY 2007 House passed bill are as follows:

Table 1
Pending FY 2007 Transportation Appropriations Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otay Mesa Border Crossing</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 52 East West Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 76</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Bus Facility, El Cajon</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey Transit Center, Oceanside</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bus Replacements</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East Trolley Extension</td>
<td>$806,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido Rail Project (SPRINTER)</td>
<td>$686,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,092,694</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 below summarizes the annual federal transportation appropriations from FY 2004 through FY 2007. Actual transportation appropriations for the San Diego region peaked in FY 2005 with passage of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users). The level of pending FY 2007 appropriations is the lowest among the four fiscal years.

Table 2
Summary of Federal Transportation Appropriations FY 2004 through FY 2007 (in $millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-FFGA Projects</td>
<td>$210.3</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA Projects</td>
<td>$267.8</td>
<td>$111.2</td>
<td>$135.5</td>
<td>$19.9</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$478.1</td>
<td>$121.1</td>
<td>$153.3</td>
<td>$32.6</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action by the Senate on the FY 2007 federal transportation appropriations process is not expected until a lame duck session that is scheduled to begin after the November 2006 elections. It is unknown whether the FY 2007 transportation appropriations bill will be finalized by this end of this calendar year.

**Proposed FY 2008 Selection Process and Criteria**

While the FY 2007 federal transportation appropriations process has yet to be completed, the process for submitting project funding proposals to our Congressional delegation for the FY 2008 funding cycle is expected to begin in February 2007. To ensure that the region is prepared to submit its funding proposals by this timeline, SANDAG should develop a list of transportation projects by January 2007.

As with last year, federal discretionary resources are expected to be limited. Therefore, the continued use of criteria for project selection would enable the San Diego region to put forth quality project proposals for the FY 2008 transportation appropriations process. Staff proposes slight modifications to the criteria used in last year's process. It is proposed that a local project first meet all three eligibility criteria before it is considered for the FY 2008 federal funding cycle. The intent of the eligibility criteria is to ensure that a proposed project is included in our adopted RTP, has at least a minimum commitment of local funding, and can use the requested funding in a timely manner.

**Proposed Eligibility Criteria**

1. Project is in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan
2. Project has the minimum non-federal match (e.g., 20 percent local/state match)
3. Requested federal funds can be obligated in FY 2008

Once a project is determined eligible, it would be reviewed by staff using the following evaluation criteria. Projects that meet a greater number of the criteria would be recommended for inclusion in the comprehensive list of transportation projects for the FY 2008 federal appropriations process.

**Proposed Evaluation Criteria**

1. Project is in construction and requires additional funding
2. Project is ready to advertise
3. Project is environmentally cleared
4. Project improves security and safety in the region
5. Project protects the region’s investment in infrastructure, including rolling stock
Next Steps

Following approval of the selection process and criteria by the Transportation Committee, staff will notify local jurisdictions, transit agencies, and Caltrans. To be considered during the FY 2008 process, agencies will have until Monday, December 18, 2006, to submit transportation project funding proposals for consideration. A draft listing of FY 2008 project proposals will be presented to the Transportation Committee in January 2007, with final Board approval scheduled for January 26, 2007.

ELLEN ROUNDTREE
Director of Government Relations

Attachment: 1. FY 2007 Transportation Project Funding Recommendations

Key Staff Contact: Ellen Roundtree, (619) 699-6960, ero@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identifier</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Existing or New Federal Request</th>
<th>Previously Received Federal Discretionary Dollars</th>
<th>Proposed Dollar Request (millions)</th>
<th>Funding Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Interstate 5/State Route 78 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>State Route 76</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Interstate 5 Sorrento Valley and Genesee Interchanges</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>North Coast Interstate 5</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>State Route 67/State Route 52 Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>State Route 52 Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Interstate 15 Managed Lanes</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>Highway and Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Interstate 5 and Interstate 8 Connectors</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>State Route 905</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>State Route 11 and East Otay Mesa Port of Entry</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$9.2</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Otay Mesa Port of Entry Truck Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>State Route 94/State Route 125 Connectors</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mission Valley East Trolley Extension</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>Transit - New Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Oceanside-Encinitas SPRINTERS Rail Project</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>Transit - New Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail Trolley Extension</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>Transit - New Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>LOSSAN Rail Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td>Transit - New Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Coastal Maintenance of Way Facility</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>Transit - New Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>East County Bus Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Oceanside Center Security and Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>San Luis Rey Transit Center</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>South Bay Bus Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Escondido Bus Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Blue Line Station Improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Command and Control Infrastructure</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related; Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Regional Bus Replacement Vehicles</td>
<td>New (sought by Transit Agencies in the Past)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$39.2</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Identifier</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Existing or New Federal Request</td>
<td>Previously Received Federal Discretionary Dollars</td>
<td>Proposed Dollar Request (millions)</td>
<td>Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Solana Beach Transit Center (placeholder)</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Transit First Implementation</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>Transit - Bus and Bus Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Regional Grade Separation Program</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Joint Transportation Operation Center</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10.8</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Clairemont Mesa/State Route 163</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Bird Rock Traffic Improvements</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Rose Creek Bikeway Bridge</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>University Avenue Mobility Plan</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>State Route 905/Heritage Interchange</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Interstate 805/La Jolla Village Drive Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT OPERATIONS CONCEPT

Introduction

The Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit (ML/BRT) facility is a project in the TransNet Early Action Program that will provide a four-lane Managed Lane facility and five BRT stations with park-and-ride facilities connected by direct access ramps along the northern portion of the 20-mile corridor between State Route (SR) 163 and SR 78. With the completion of this ML/BRT facility in 2012, BRT service would be launched in the I-15 corridor between downtown San Diego and Escondido that would utilize the ML and BRT stations in the northern part of the corridor. BRT stations along I-15 in Mid-City at El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue also are included in the I-15 TransNet Early Action project. Attachment 1 shows the I-15 corridor and station locations in 2012.¹

Over the past year, a group of SANDAG, North County Transit District (NCTD), Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and Caltrans staffs has worked to develop an initial “BRT operations concept” that will be used to help finalize BRT station design plans, identify BRT service capital and operating costs, and explore BRT vehicle options. The BRT operations concept (including analysis of demand, level of service, routings, and station design/park-and-ride requirements) is the primary focus of this report since it is needed in order to finalize design plans for the BRT stations. Action today would allow us to move ahead with the final station design plans. The work to date has identified a number of issues that the four agencies will be working on over the coming months regarding BRT service capital and operating costs and BRT vehicles. These issue areas also are outlined in this report.

¹ Note: A second phase of improvements to provide High Occupancy Vehicle facilities along I-15 south of SR 163 and along SR 94 west of I-15, as well as BRT stations in Kearny Mesa and Mission Valley is currently under study. No timetable for completion of this second phase has been set.
Discussion

BRT Demand Analysis

Current ridership on I-15 transit services shows strong demand between downtown San Diego and Kearny Mesa/Mira Mesa, with this demand continuing to grow in the future. Through an analysis of major employment data in the region supplemented by SANDAG’s long-range demographic forecast, it was determined there also is significant demand for BRT in the north I-15 corridor between SR 163 and SR 78. Peak period travel forecast demand for 2015 shows a strong transit ridership potential for both the downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa/University City markets. As shown in Attachment 2, assuming peak period buses running every 10 minutes, the average ridership for each trip ranges from 67 to 69 passengers at the peak load point.

A majority of potential riders live within 2.5 miles of the corridor, suggesting the catchment area for service is fairly close to the core area around the I-15 freeway corridor. Within this catchment area, land use densities are relatively low and roadway connectivity is limited, meaning that walk access to transit stops is limited.

In terms of BRT route design, this analysis led to the following conclusions:

- **Auto access (park-and-ride, kiss-and-ride) is likely to be the predominant access to BRT services in the corridor, especially for commuters in the peak period. (Auto access is the primary way that passengers connect to the existing commuter express services in the I-15 corridor.)**

- **Access to BRT services should be focused at the I-15 BRT stations; extensive branching BRT services off the corridor would not be cost-effective given the current land use patterns as well as the increased operating costs versus the limited number of riders who would have walk access to BRT stops.**

- **Focus of BRT services at the I-15 BRT stations allows a high level of service frequency to be provided at a given station, thereby increasing the convenience and attractiveness to choice riders.**

Forecasts also indicate a fairly significant demand for BRT service from Riverside County that is expected to grow over time.

BRT Operations Concept

Using the results of the analysis above, the following operations concept was developed and assumes launching of full BRT service in 2012 once the full Managed Lanes/BRT station facilities are completed between SR 163 and SR 78.

2012 Operations

The operations concept for 2012 involves two types of BRT services: (1) an all-day core service between Escondido and downtown San Diego, serving all stations along the north I-15 ML/BRT facility along with transfer connections in Kearny Mesa and Mid-City, with 15-minute frequencies during the peak period and 30 minutes during the off-peak and weekends; and (2) a series of peak-
period BRT services designed to provide limited-stop, point-to-point services for commuters headed to key job centers in downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa/University City. These peak-period services would operate southbound in the morning, and northbound in the evening.

Two options have been identified for the peak-period BRT services (see Attachment 3).

1. Option 1 focuses the peak-period services on access to downtown San Diego using limited-stop routings:

   • Escondido to downtown via Mira Mesa BRT Station, operating every 10 minutes in the peak period.
   • Rancho Bernardo BRT Station to downtown via Sabre Springs and Mira Mesa BRT stations, operating every 10 minutes in the peak period.
   • Options for service from Carmel Mountain Ranch to downtown via Sabre Springs BRT station, and Rancho Penasquitos to downtown via Mira Mesa BRT station, each operating every 30 minutes. These services would operate from existing park-and-ride lots in Rancho Penasquitos or Carmel Mountain Ranch.

2. Option 2 is similar to Option 1, except that instead of focusing solely on the downtown San Diego market, a peak-period service also would be initiated to serve the Sorrento Mesa/University City market. This option would operate an Escondido to Sorrento Mesa/University City service via Sabre Springs and Mira Mesa BRT stations in lieu of the Carmel Mountain Ranch/Rancho Penasquitos service and by decreasing peak-period service frequencies from 10 minutes to 15 minutes from Escondido and Rancho Bernardo, as proposed in Option 1.

MTS and NCTD staffs prefer to pursue Option 2 that would provide high-speed commuter service to the major employment centers in Sorrento Mesa, University City, and at the University of California, San Diego. The one concern that has been raised is the level of congestion along Mira Mesa Boulevard, the main routing between Mira Mesa and Sorrento Mesa. Since the aim of these peak-period services is high-speed operations, options for improving transit speeds through implementation of transit priority measures such as queue jumpers and signal priority treatments may need to be studied. This issue will be further evaluated in the coming months. Until that analysis is completed, we are recommending keeping both Options 1 and 2 open.

SANDAG’s transportation model was used to forecast ridership for the proposed service concept. It is anticipated that 12,000 riders will use the BRT service between Escondido and downtown San Diego each weekday by 2015. An analysis of travel times shows that the proposed concept is competitive with driving in the corridor. For example, the Escondido to downtown express BRT trip is estimated to take an average of 63 minutes, the same travel time as single-occupant vehicle travel based on surveys in 2003.

2008-2011 Operations

While full BRT service will not be launched until 2012, improvements to existing I-15 transit services will be made during the interim years 2008-2011 to take advantage of the Managed Lanes, direct access ramps, and stations as they are opened. The Del Lago, Rancho Bernardo, and Sabre Springs
BRT stations will be partially open during this period with some park-and-ride spaces and bus stops/tumarounds, but without the full BRT station amenities and park-and-ride facilities. Existing transit services will be realigned to serve these facilities with temporary bus stops so that they can take advantage of the Managed Lanes facility as it opens in phases, which will provide passengers with reduced travel times, especially for commuter express bus riders.

Station Design Issues

This recommended BRT operations concept has significant implications for the I-15 BRT station design, notably the need for additional park-and-ride capacity. As originally envisioned, the parking currently included at the I-15 stations would be supplemented by remote park-and-ride facilities served by BRT branch services. Since the results of the BRT demand analysis have indicated BRT services with extensive branching would not be a cost-effective solution, the I-15 BRT stations will be the key park-and-ride access points for the surrounding communities.

As part of the BRT operations planning effort, we assessed the future park-and-ride demand based not only on BRT operations, but carpool/vanpool demand as well since the stations are a multimodal facility. This assessment came up with the following demand estimations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Current Planned Park-n-Ride Spaces</th>
<th>Estimated 2015 Park-and Ride Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Transit Center</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Lago</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Springs</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, significant shortfalls in planned parking capacity exist at several of the stations needed to support the recommended BRT operations concept and accommodate carpool/vanpool users. Finding ways to accommodate the parking need for all modes is imperative to the success of the planned BRT services; not doing so will greatly limit access to these services and stunt ridership growth. In a few cases, parking needs can potentially be accommodated at adjacent sites. At most of the BRT stations along the corridor, parking structures will likely be needed to accommodate future demand. For the Escondido Transit Center, there may be additional parking available at the nearby Center for the Performing Arts that would require only a short extension of BRT services. (In cases where potential adjacent sites have been identified, the jurisdictions or property owners have not yet been formally contacted.) In addition, there is significant park-and-ride demand coming from Riverside commuters who drive to Escondido, then ride transit for the duration of their trip. We have discussed these findings with the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) and have begun to explore ideas for possible transit connections north of Escondido to serve these commuters more directly. If such services were implemented, they would help mitigate the short-term need for additional parking at the Escondido Transit Center. However, a parking structure to meet long-term needs at the Escondido Transit Center will be evaluated, because high demand expected with the addition of SPRINTER service in 2007, new regional service connections, and the expected growth in NCTD bus ridership. For the Del Lago station, we are working with the City of Escondido on an adjacent site that could be used by carpool/vanpool users that would offset the need to expand parking at that BRT station.
For the Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, and Mira Mesa BRT stations, expanding parking at the stations will be necessary. The surrounding area around the stations was evaluated for additional parking but no reasonable options were found due to a lack of available parking and/or the negative impact it would have on BRT operating costs and out-of-direction travel times. Because of the limited site constraints at these three stations and surrounding development, parking structures are the only way to accommodate park-and-ride demand. The Rancho Bernardo and Sabre Springs station footprints were designed to accommodate a possible parking structure, but additional work is needed to determine the actual design. For the Mira Mesa station located at the north end of Miramar Community College, we are working with the San Diego Community College District on a possible joint parking structure adjacent to the BRT station site, but no detailed engineering/design work has yet be undertaken.

It should be pointed out that the TransNet Early Action budget for the I-15 ML/BRT project does not include funding for these parking structures, so future action by the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors will be needed to identify funding for their future construction. The first steps will be to undertake environmental, engineering and design studies, and to develop detailed capital cost estimates. Given that parking structures will require a significant capital investment, staff also will explore the potential for public/private partnerships. Such partnerships could include station naming rights and/or joint parking structures with adjacent developments. In addition, pricing strategies will be evaluated that could better manage park-and-ride demand (and minimize the need for parking structures) at the I-15 BRT stations. An example of a possible pricing strategy would be to charge carpools/vanpools for parking at I-15 stations as a way to encourage their use of free remote park-and-ride locations.

Other Issues/Next Steps

Applying the BRT operations concept today is only the first in a number of decisions that will need to be made regarding I-15 BRT operations. SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staffs will continue to work on a number of other key issue areas, outlined below:

- **Station Amenities** – As outlined in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, the vision for BRT is of a “rail-like” service, with many of the same attributes as the Trolley and COASTER. Station amenities include next vehicle information, ticket vending machines, and enhanced passenger waiting facilities. Each of these features, while desirable, add to the capital and operating costs of developing and operating BRT services.

- **BRT Operations Capital Start-Up** – To ensure a high quality service level that will be attractive to choice riders, an investment in dispatch and radio equipment will be needed to monitor BRT services. Detailed capital estimates are being developed.

- **BRT Vehicles** – The BRT operating concept will require high-capacity transit vehicles (e.g., articulated or double-decker vehicles) in order to meet projected demand. Depending on the level of vehicle amenities and “new look” design, an initial review of the bus marketplace shows that the costs per vehicle could exceed $1 million, which is significantly higher than the $650,000 cost for a conventional articulated bus (with Compressed Natural Gas engine). It is likely that different vehicle types will be needed for the all-day core service (with more frequent stops and high passenger turnover) versus the peak-period services (with limited stops and point-to-point ridership).
The vehicle type selected also will have implications for maintenance facilities, with expanded or new facilities possibly being needed to handle I-15 BRT operations. Since I-15 services will be the first of planned regional BRT services, discussion of longer-term BRT maintenance facilities also needs to be evaluated.

- **BRT Branding** – There is a desire to develop a unique branding for the I-15 and other BRT services planned for the region that will reflect the high-speed service and rail-like amenities. Unique vehicle colors, name, logo, and interior styling can all contribute to making the service attractive to captive and choice riders alike, similar to that used today on the COASTER and Trolley. Per the provisions in the recently revised SANDAG Policy No. 018 (Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation), we will work towards developing a regional branding scheme for BRT that is mutually agreeable to SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD, and is consistent with the individual branding schemes used by the two transit operators.

- **Station Maintenance** – As with the rail stations throughout the region, the I-15 stations will require ongoing maintenance and security. Using the Trolley and COASTER stations as a guide, we are developing detailed estimates of the various cost components, including: general cleaning, landscape maintenance, parking lot maintenance and repair, graffiti removal, utilities, security surveillance (both cameras and personnel), and maintenance of passenger facilities. Should parking structures be constructed at some stations, the added maintenance costs of these improvements also will have to be included. Finally, the Rancho Bernardo and Sabre Springs stations have access roads connecting the local streets with the direct access ramps and Managed Lanes that will need to be maintained.

In addition to being the focal point for access to BRT services, the I-15 stations will be multimodal facilities used by carpool/vanpool and FasTrak users. Thus, station maintenance will need to be a shared responsibility among several agencies, including SANDAG, Caltrans, transit operators, and local jurisdictions. Determining how best to undertake a joint maintenance effort and fair share costs will be a key work effort.

- **Feeder Bus Services** – The BRT operations plan discussed above assumes the realignment of existing Route 20 (which operates between downtown San Diego and the North County Fair Shopping Center) into the all-day core BRT service operating along the I-15 Managed Lanes facility. The concern is that some communities served by Route 20 could be without transit access. While other local bus routes (e.g. Routes 844 and 845) could be realigned to serve some areas, it appears that new local feeder service(s) will be needed to fill in some areas that would no longer be served by Route 20. Funding for feeder services is not included in the TransNet I-15 project.

As part of the work effort on these issues, the collective impact of the capital and operating costs on the I-15 ML/BRT TransNet Early Action project budget will need to be addressed. While estimates for these various cost items were factored into the TransNet project budget, the work effort underway will update these costs. Should additional cost items like parking structures be included, additional budget will likely be needed to cover both increased capital and operating costs. It should be noted that the TransNet program does not include funds for parking structures or a centralized BRT maintenance facility.

As SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staffs work through these various issues, we expect we will bring a number of periodic reports to the Transportation Committee for your direction and input.
Stakeholder Comments

A number of comments from various stakeholders have been received, which are summarized in Attachment 4. We will factor these comments into our continued I-15 BRT work efforts.

BOB LEITEN
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Map of BRT Stations in 2012
2. I-15 Corridor BRT Demand
3. BRT Service Concept
4. Stakeholder Comments

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
I-15 BRT Stations in 2012

Escondido Transit Station

Del Lago

Rancho Bernardo

Sabre Springs/Penasquitos

Mira Mesa

Kearny Mesa (Future)

Green Line Station (Future)

Mid-City Plazas

Downtown San Diego

San Diego Region

Map Not To Scale
September 2006
BRT Demand to Mid-City/ Downtown San Diego

Estimated 2015 Peak Trip Average Load Per Segment (assuming 10 minute peak service frequency)

BRT Demand to Sorrento Mesa/ UCSD/UC

Estimated 2015 Peak Trip Average Load Per Segment (assuming 10 minute peak service frequency)
Option 1 – 2012 BRT Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido - Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo - Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Mtn - Downtown (option)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Penas. - Downtown (option)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 – 2012 BRT Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido - Downtown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo - Downtown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido - Sorrento/ UTC/UCSD</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Comments

The NCTD Planning Committee and Board of Directors (at their September 7, 2006, and September 21, 2006, respectively) had these comments on the concept plan:

- Refer the Plan to the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) for further interagency review with MTS and SANDAG on November 2, 2006, at 1 p.m. at NCTD.
- Pay particular attention to vehicle quality.
- Suggested that the farebox recovery rate may optimistic (in TransNet, it was assumed that 40 percent of costs would come from passenger fares.)
- Consider using SR 56 instead of Mira Mesa Boulevard for the Sorrento Mesa BRT service.

At its September 20, 2006, meeting, the TransNet Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee had these comments on the plan:

- Asked about what contingencies are planned if anticipated farebox revenue is not initially met.
- Suggested the possible need for transit priorities, either from the stations or potential remote park-and-ride locations to ensure that the bus can move quickly onto the managed lanes facility.
- Inquired whether there will be one operator for the BRT services, even though the corridor crosses the two transit districts.
- Asked about how the Riverside demand would be served.
- Discussed the importance of the median Mid-City Transit Plazas as originally planned and supported by the community in response to public comment.

The MTS Executive Committee was given a briefing by MTS staff at its September 21, 2006, meeting. Comments and questions were raised on a number of topics, including:

- Raised the question of whether there is need for ticket vending machines in light of the pending implementation of the Smart Card fare technology. Requested a comparison of on-board fareboxes and ticket vending machines.
- Commented that buses should have adequate seating capacity, and number of seated passengers per trip per bus should be maximized in order to minimize operating costs. Also suggested that there was a need for different types of vehicles for the all-day core service versus the peak-period services.
- Felt that the outside look of the bus should be the least important concern when choosing vehicles for this service; rather, the cost of operating the service should be paramount.
PROPOSED CHANGES TO FasTrak™ PROGRAM AND AMENDED
AND RESTATED MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
WITH MTS FOR I-15 TRANSIT SERVICES

File Numbers 6000200, 6000201

Introduction
Since 1996, SANDAG has administered the FasTrak value pricing program on Interstate 15 (I-15) which allows single-occupant vehicles to pay a fee for use of the reversible high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes on I-15 between State Route 163 (SR 163) and SR 56/Ted Williams Parkway. By state law, the net revenues generated by the program are used to improve transit and carpool services in the I-15 corridor.

Prior to the opening of SR 56 in July 2004, FasTrak revenues had steadily grown since the program started. With the completion of SR 56, drivers now have a choice to commute down the I-15 corridor or to exit I-15 to SR 56 in order to connect to areas along the I-5 corridor. A high proportion of motorists have chosen the latter route, causing FasTrak use and therefore revenues to decline dramatically. This problem has been compounded by the program’s outdated fee structure, which was originally adopted in 1997.

Since 1997, FasTrak toll revenues have provided more than $7 million in funding for the Inland Breeze express bus service which operates in the I-15 corridor. This Route 980/990 connects the Rancho Bernardo and Poway areas with downtown San Diego every 30 minutes during the peak commute period. As part of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis recently completed by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), the Inland Breeze route was found to be redundant with existing commuter express services and has therefore been recommended for discontinuation effective January 2007. In place of this service, MTS has restructured its existing I-15 express services to better serve those communities and improve the cost-effectiveness of I-15 corridor transit operations.

Recommendation
The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors:

(1) Approve Resolution No. 2007-08, concerning the updated FasTrak Value Pricing Policy for the I-15 Corridor (Attachment 1); and

(2) Authorize the Executive Director to execute an Amended and Restated Memorandum of Understanding and Fund Transfer Agreement with the Metropolitan Transit System, in substantially the same form as Attachment 2, in order to continue to provide I-15 FasTrak funding to support I-15 corridor transit services beginning in FY 2007.
Because of the decline in FasTrak revenues following the opening of SR 56 and in an effort to continue the agency’s goal of supporting I-15 transit improvements with FasTrak toll revenue, SANDAG and MTS have developed a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Fund Transfer Agreement to continue this partnership. Central to continuing these funds is the recommendation to (1) increase the minimum FasTrak toll rate from $0.50 to $1.25, and (2) to charge a monthly FasTrak account inactivity fee. Neither of these two changes has been implemented in the past.

Discussion

FasTrak Program

I-15 FasTrak was the first facility of its kind in the world; it employs “dynamic pricing” and uses electronic toll collection technology to vary solo driver fees in real-time. Dynamic pricing means that the system measures traffic flow in real-time and adjusts the price routinely (currently every six minutes) to ensure that it matches the level of traffic. SANDAG currently operates the FasTrak program under contract to a private sector toll operator.

Traffic and Toll Trends

In July 2004, SR 56 opened to through traffic between I-15 and I-5 connecting Inland North County communities with the San Diego and Del Mar coastline. The combination of construction-related delays related to the Managed Lanes and the availability of an alternate route for commuters whose trips either begin or end near I-15 has resulted in a substantial drop in total trips and toll revenue for FasTrak.

Prior to the opening of SR 56, demand for FasTrak had grown rapidly since the program started. Between 1996 and 2004 average weekday traffic increased 137 percent (from 9,400 vehicles to 22,300 vehicles). In stark contrast, from July 2004, to July 2006, average weekday traffic declined 30 percent (from 22,300 vehicles to 15,600 vehicles).

Revenue Outlook

The combination of declining traffic and lower average toll rates have resulted in substantially lower annual toll revenues in the prior two fiscal years than in preceding years. Annual FasTrak revenue from tolls declined 40 percent from FY 2004 ($2.2 million) to FY 2006 ($1.3 million). Prior to 2004, annual growth in toll revenue averaged 21 percent, with revenue peaking at $2.4 million in FY 2003. With declining FasTrak revenue and an increase in fixed expenditures related to the Managed Lanes implementation, we are forecasting a lower revenue subsidy pass-through in FY 2007 and FY 2008 until the new Managed Lanes become operational.

Reserve Funding and Transit Pass-Through

FasTrak requires a critical operating reserve equal to roughly 10 percent of the program’s annual budget due to the risk of major equipment failure, and to ensure normal equipment maintenance and replacement cycles are met. Due to the longstanding commitment to fund transit in the corridor, FasTrak actually dipped into its operating reserves in FY 2005 and FY 2006 in order to meet a standing funding obligation through an existing MOU with MTS. SANDAG provided $955,000 to MTS in FY 2005, and $985,000 in FY 2006 to fund the Inland Breeze.
FasTrak: A Customer Service Operation

While toll revenues are falling, FasTrak continues to bear the cost of a growing customer base. SANDAG’s FasTrak program currently manages more than 19,000 accounts and has issued close to 30,000 transponders to those accounts. A high proportion of FasTrak customers do not actively use the reversible HOV lanes while driving alone. During FY 2006, approximately 50 percent (more than 10,000 accounts) were “very infrequent” users, making less than 10 FasTrak trips on I-15, and spending less than $25 in total tolls for the year. More than three-quarters of the traffic using the I-15 HOV lanes each day are carpools, vanpools, and buses, which travel for free. In contrast, a relatively small number of customers (approximately 1,500 accounts) are frequent users, and this group accounted for more than 50 percent of all tolls collected on I-15 during the year.

Regardless of a customer’s actual use, SANDAG spends roughly the same amount on all FasTrak accounts, which costs include the transponder expense, printing and mailing costs for customer correspondence, and customer support. The average cost to maintain an I-15 FasTrak account is estimated to be $3.23 per month. SANDAG does not currently charge FasTrak customers a minimum usage fee (or other account maintenance/service fees).

Proposed Fee Schedule Modifications

The recommended changes in Attachment 1 are the result of an extensive analysis of traffic, account, and revenue data. The objective of this analysis was to conduct a comparison of fees and rates from similar facilities and to balance the need for revenue with the goal of maintaining efficient and effective traffic operations in the I-15 corridor. Staff recommends two changes in order to generate additional revenue for FasTrak:

Change 1: Charge monthly account fee

SANDAG does not charge FasTrak customers a minimum usage or other account fee although similar fees exist for other FasTrak agencies. These fees can be assessed on a ‘per transponder’ or ‘per account’ basis. Similar agencies charge between $1.50 and $7.00 per transponder per month (equivalent to $2.25 and $10.00 per account per month based on an average 1.5 transponders per account), with some offering to waive the fee if a certain amount of activity is maintained.

Staff analyzed implementing an account fee ranging from $2 to $5 per month with activity waiver levels of $5, $10, and $15. The $3.50 per month account fee with a $10 waiver level was deemed to be consistent with other agencies’ fees and the optimum level for this charge. This level has the potential to generate the most revenue while minimizing the number of FasTrak transactions lost from reactions to price sensitivity.

Change 2: Raise the minimum toll rate

SANDAG has never modified the minimum toll rate that was adopted in 1997. For an 8-mile facility, the existing $0.50 minimum toll equates to @$0.06/mile. Comparable facilities in California and the United States charge between $0.10 and $0.30 per mile. Staff analyzed impacts on revenue and price sensitivity if the minimum toll rate were raised to: $0.75 ($0.09/mile), $1.00 ($0.125/mile), $1.25 ($0.16/mile), or $1.50 ($0.19/mile). The $1.25 minimum toll rate was deemed to be the optimum minimum price and is consistent with similar toll facilities.
Revenue Impact of Proposed Changes

Based on the addition of a $3.50 monthly account fee (with a waiver of the fee for accounts exceeding $10 in tolls for the same month), and an increase in the minimum toll rate to $1.25, staff estimates approximately $540,000 in additional FasTrak revenue can be raised per year. This amount would provide sufficient revenue to support the transit funding in the revised MOU, and still maintain critical FasTrak operating reserves ($200,000).

Additionally, staff is recommending that the refundable security deposit for a transponder be lowered from its existing level of $40 to $25 which represents SANDAG’s current cost to acquire each device. If approved, the difference in the transponder deposit amount would be credited towards the customer’s existing FasTrak balance.

Transit Improvements

Since 2001, approximately $1 million annually has been provided for the Route 980/990 Inland Breeze, a peak period express service between the Rancho Bernardo and Poway areas and downtown San Diego. The MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis recommended the cancellation of the Inland Breeze in January 2007 and a restructuring of existing I-15 commuter express routes to better serve these areas.

Because of the decline in FasTrak revenues since 2003, SANDAG proposes to provide $800,000 in FY 2007 to MTS for corridor transit improvements. If the FasTrak program fee changes recommended in this report are approved, staff believes that $500,000 will be available annually for transit services starting in FY 2008. However, more refined revenue forecasts are expected in early 2008. At that time, SANDAG and MTS will have the option to revisit the MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement. Both SANDAG and MTS are desirous of retaining the existing services in the I-15 corridor in advance of the implementation of the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit services in 2012 (see Agenda Item no. 6). To this end, we are committed to maximizing the available revenues from FasTrak to fund or enhance these services between now and 2012. These changes have been developed by SANDAG and MTS staff and are included as Attachment 2.

JACK BODA  
Departmental Director, Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. Resolution No. 2007-08, FasTrak Value Pricing Policy for the I-15 Corridor  
2. Draft MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement between SANDAG and MTS for Operation of Transit Services in the I-15 Corridor Funded by the I-15 FasTrak Value Pricing Project FY 2007 to FY 2011

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org
APPROVING A REVISED FASTRAK™ VALUE PRICING POLICY FOR THE I-15 CORRIDOR

WHEREAS, Existing law \(^1\) authorizes SANDAG, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation, to conduct, administer, and operate a value pricing and transit development program on Interstate 15 (I-15), pursuant to which drivers of single-occupant vehicles are allowed to use the I-15 high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) expressway (“the Facility”) in return for their payment of a fee; and

WHEREAS, on November 21, 1997, SANDAG passed Board Resolution No. 1998-20, adopting the Full Implementation Fee Schedule for the I-15 Value Pricing Project, which established the initial fee structure and range of fees that SANDAG is authorized to charge single-occupant vehicle drivers willing to pay the fee in exchange for their use of the Facility; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 27565 of the Streets and Highways Code,\(^2\) SANDAG shall collect fees pursuant to the above authorizations entirely through its I-15 FasTrak electronic toll collection system, which ensures the use of equipment that is interoperable with electronic toll collection systems currently operating in California; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 149.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, SANDAG shall utilize its value pricing and toll collection system to ensure that an adequate level of service (defined as level of service C) is maintained, and that unrestricted access to the Facility by high-occupancy vehicles shall be available at all times; and

WHEREAS, one of the primary goals of the I-15 FasTrak program is to generate sufficient revenue to be used exclusively in the I-15 corridor for the improvement of transit service, including, but not limited to, support for transit operations, and high-occupancy vehicle facilities; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has not modified the Full Implementation Fee Schedule for the I-15 Value Pricing Project since it was initially adopted as Board Resolution No. 1998-20; and

WHEREAS, it is from time to time necessary for SANDAG to adjust the range of fees that SANDAG is authorized to charge for single-occupant use of the Facility, in order that an adequate level of service is maintained and in an effort to generate sufficient revenue for enhanced I-15 corridor transit service and to pay for costs incurred in connection with the implementation or operation of the I-15 FasTrak program; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the SANDAG Board of Directors does hereby adopt the following updated FasTrak Value Pricing Policy for the I-15 Corridor, which would take effect on November 1, 2006, or the soonest date thereafter following implementation of the pricing changes:

---

\(^1\) Section 27565 of the Streets and Highways Code

\(^2\) Section 149.1 of the Streets and Highways Code
The I-15 FasTrak fees shall be set at the lowest price necessary to maintain level of service C or better on the Facility, within the following limitations and constraints:

- Fees shall be charged on a per trip basis.

- The minimum per-trip fee shall be $1.25. Under normal traffic conditions, the peak period per-trip fee will average approximately $3.00 to $4.00. During unusual traffic conditions (such as those caused by major accidents), the maximum per-trip fee could be as high as $8.00.

- Fees shall be established using a stepped fee structure under which fees are lower when there is less traffic on the Facility and higher when there is more traffic on the Facility. Staff will maintain the traffic flows and adjust the fees to maintain level of service C.

- Within each fee step, the fee change shall not exceed $0.50 during normal conditions when real-time traffic levels are within the level of service C target range. The fee change shall not exceed $1.00 during unusual conditions when real-time traffic levels in the Facility approach or exceed the level of service C upper limit.

- Fees shall be computed dynamically, and in real-time, based on traffic conditions as detected by the FasTrak electronic toll collection system or from data collected by SANDAG’s Intermodal Transportation Management System. The exact algorithm for computing the toll rate shall be determined by SANDAG and modified as necessary to effectively manage the system.

- SANDAG shall establish and maintain certain FasTrak Account Payments, Fees, and Charges, the terms and amounts for which SANDAG shall disclose to all patrons through the FasTrak License Agreement that all patrons are required to sign when they open a FasTrak account. The terms of the FasTrak License Agreement including the Payments, Fees, and Charges are subject to change and SANDAG shall provide written notice to all patrons of any such change.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th of October 2006.
This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is made and entered into effective as of this 27th day of October, 2006, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) and Metropolitan Transit System (“MTS”).

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) administers the Interstate 15 (I-15) FasTrak Value Pricing Project (Project) in which single-occupant vehicles are able to access the I-15 high-occupancy-vehicle lanes for a fee; and

WHEREAS, state law permits a portion of the fee revenues generated by the Project to be allocated for the provision of public transit services in the I-15 corridor, and such fee revenues have been used to fund the operation of Routes 980/990 “Inland Breeze” express bus service, which serves the I-15 corridor, since 1997; and

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2001, the SANDAG Board of Directors authorized the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Fund Transfer Agreement for January 1, 2002, to June 30, 2004, with the option to extend the funding period for three additional years ending June 30, 2007, in order for SANDAG to fund the Inland Breeze with Project revenues; and

WHEREAS, on August 30, 2004, the option to extend was exercised via the First Amendment, which extended the MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement through June 30, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the region’s first Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service will operate along the I-15 corridor beginning in 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Project revenues that MTS has currently dedicated to I-15 transit services, together with TransNet and FasTrak funding, will be needed in order to provide the preferred level of BRT service to the corridor; and

WHEREAS, key BRT decisions must be completed between FY 2007 and FY 2011 in terms of number and type of vehicles, marketing, branding, station designs, and other developments that depend on this preferred level of BRT service and funding; and

WHEREAS, MTS as part of its Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) has redesigned transit services along the I-15 corridor to improve service efficiency and productivity, and has, as part of that restructuring, renumbered the routes in this area to provide consistent route number identification; and
WHEREAS, MTS will no longer use the route numbers 980 or 990 in favor of 800 series route numbers to identify service in the I-15 corridor;

WHEREAS, California Streets & Highways Code section 149.1 states that SANDAG’s use of FasTrak revenues shall be used within the I-15 corridor “exclusively for (A) the improvement of transit service, including, but not limited to, support for transit operations, and (B) high-occupancy-vehicle facilities and shall not be used for any other purpose;” and

WHEREAS, a new MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement is needed for SANDAG to continue to fund I-15 corridor transit services.

AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. This MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement replaces MTS Doc. No. B0153.4-97.

2. SANDAG will pay MTS an amount not to exceed $800,000 for the period beginning July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, and $500,000 for the period beginning July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008. MTS shall use these funds on expenditures for public transit in the I-15 corridor.

3. SANDAG will pay MTS an amount of at least $500,000 for each of these annual periods: (1) July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009; (2) July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010; and (3) July 1, 2010, through June 30, 2011. MTS shall use these funds on expenditures for public transit in the I-15 corridor.

4. All funds provided by SANDAG to MTS under this MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement shall be used exclusively for the improvement of transit service, including, but not limited to, support for transit operations.

5. SANDAG will use its best efforts to maximize revenue contributions for transit services in the I-15 corridor, including returning Project revenue contributions to FY 2006 levels or higher to support both current and future enhancements to those services, and will estimate each April the revenue associated with the Project to determine if the subsidy to MTS for transit services along the I-15 corridor can be increased above the annual $500,000 allocation beginning in FY 2008. Should Project revenue contributions exceed the FY 2006 funding levels ($985,000), MTS will use the additional funds to implement or maintain service enhancements based on the I-15 BRT operations concept plan.

6. Neither MTS nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify and save harmless MTS, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU.
7. MTS shares the desire of SANDAG to maintain existing I-15 service levels leading up to implementation of a 2012 BRT operations plan, but may adjust service levels due to unforeseen and significant impacts to funding or ridership demand. In any event, however, the parties agree that MTS may only use funds provided by SANDAG under this MOU for the improvement of transit service, including, but not limited to, support for transit operations, in the I-15 corridor as required by Streets & Highways Code section 149.1.

8. MTS will invoice and SANDAG will make the following payments to MTS for reimbursement of expenditures for I-15 corridor services according to this payment schedule:

- $400,000 January 1, 2007
- $200,000 April 1, 2007
- $200,000 June 30, 2007
- $125,000 October 1, 2007
- $125,000 January 1, 2008
- $125,000 April 1, 2008
- $125,000 June 30, 2008

9. Unless this MOU and Fund Transfer Agreement is otherwise amended, MTS will invoice SANDAG and SANDAG will make quarterly payments of $125,000 for FY 2009, FY 2010, and FY 2011 for I-15 corridor transit service expenditures.

10. MTS is responsible for the day-to-day operation of I-15 corridor transit services and has the authority to adjust service levels based on passenger demand, productivity of the service, and/or funding levels. MTS will review any planned major routes or service level changes with SANDAG to assess impacts to the intent of this MOU.

11. MTS will provide SANDAG information on ridership of I-15 corridor services at the end of each fiscal year. The report will analyze the ridership trends over time and compare the ridership to other peak-period express bus services in other corridors.

12. Neither SANDAG nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, MTS shall fully defend, indemnify and save harmless SANDAG, all officers and employees from all claims, suits or actions of every name, kind and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with any work, authority or jurisdiction delegated to MTS under this MOU.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. SANDAG and MTS will jointly work to produce and implement an operations concept plan for I-15 BRT service. Responsibilities for specific issues, including station design, vehicle procurement, marketing and branding shall be guided by SANDAG Board Policy No. 018.

2. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this MOU are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.
3. Any notice required or permitted under this MOU may be personally served on the other party, by the party giving notice, or may be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following addresses:

   For SANDAG                          For San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
   401 B Street, Suite 800            1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
   San Diego, CA 92101                San Diego, CA 92101-7490
   Attn: Name                         Attn: Name

4. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU is subject to termination upon a minimum of a 90 days' written notice by either party and automatically upon termination of legislative or administrative authorization of the Program by any state or federal government agency. Should SANDAG terminate this agreement, SANDAG shall reimburse MTS for all reasonable costs directly associated with providing service until the next scheduled route change but not to exceed the payment provisions identified in this agreement.

5. The indemnification provisions of this MOU shall survive termination of the MOU.

6. This MOU shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. If any action is brought to interpret or enforce any term of this MOU, the action shall be brought in a state or federal court situated in the County of San Diego, State of California.

7. All terms, conditions, and provisions hereof shall inure to and shall bind each of the parties hereto, and each of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

8. For purposes of this MOU, the relationship of the parties is that of independent entities and not as agents of each other or as joint venturers or partners. The parties shall maintain sole and exclusive control over their personnel, agents, consultants, and operations.

9. No alteration or variation of the terms of this MOU shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated herein shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

10. Nothing in the provisions of this MOU is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties to this MOU or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOU.

11. This MOU may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this MOU effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM  SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

PAUL C. JABLONSKI                      GARY L. GALLEGOS
Chief Executive Officer                Executive Director

Date:_______________________________  Date:_______________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  APPROVED AS TO FORM

________________________________   ________________________________
Office of General Counsel              Office of General Counsel

Date:_______________________________  Date:_______________________________
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

October 6, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: APPROVE

FY 2006 JOBS ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE/
NEW FREEDOM FUNDING PROCESS

File Number 3002300

Introduction

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), the surface transportation reauthorization bill passed by Congress in 2005, extended the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316) funding program and created a new funding program called New Freedom (Section 5317). JARC funds can be used for capital or operating costs for services designed to provide transit service to job sites for persons of limited means. New Freedom funds may be used to provide capital and operating funds for transit service for persons with disabilities. SANDAG is the designated recipient and must comply with certain federal requirements to allocate these formula funds, including preparing a Coordinated Public Transit and Human Service Transportation Plan and developing and managing an annual competitive process to grant the funds to operating agencies, which can include both public transit agencies and nonprofit human services agencies. This report outlines a proposed process for allocating FY 2006 JARC and New Freedom funds.

Discussion

SANDAG has been selected by the Governor of California to be the designated recipient of the JARC and New Freedom federal funding for the San Diego County urbanized area. Caltrans is the designated recipient for small urban and rural areas in San Diego County. For FY 2006, the urbanized portion of San Diego County has been allocated $1.415 million for JARC and $672,000 for New Freedom programs. The funds from both of these programs require a 50 percent local match for operating projects, and a 20 percent local match for capital projects. SANDAG also may use up to 10 percent of the funds in each year to prepare the Coordinated Public Transit and Human Service Transportation Plan and administer the competitive process. SANDAG may award program funds to the transit agencies, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), private providers or nonprofit agencies and providers.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve:

1. Holding an open, competitive process during fall 2006 to seek projects eligible for funding under Federal Transit Administration JARC and New Freedom funding programs; and
2. Prioritizing eligible projects using the scoring criteria included Attachment 3.
Due to the delay at the federal level in developing guidance for implementation for the two funding programs, the rules that govern the grant process for FY 2006 are different from those that will apply in subsequent years. Funds for FY 2006 may be granted without the Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan. To receive JARC and New Freedom funding in FY 2007 and beyond, the funded projects and services must be included in the Coordinated Public Transit and Human Service Transportation Plan (updated annually) and are subject to an annual competitive process.

**JARC Program**

JARC funds for FY 2006 can only be granted for projects identified in a previous Jobs Access and Reverse Commute planning document. Any money not awarded under the interim rules for FY 2006 will be rolled into the next year’s funding and made available for projects or services meeting the rules in FY 2007 or subsequent years.

SANDAG prepared “Welfare to Work” studies in 1999 and 2003. These studies meet the SAFETEA-LU requirement for a Jobs Access and Reverse Commute plan. The 2003 SANDAG study led to implementation of two services now operated by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Since their inception, these services have been funded by JARC funds made available by the previous federal legislation (Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA-21]). Other routes and services proposed in the 1999 and 2003 studies also would be eligible for FY 2006 JARC funding. These eligible routes and services are listed in the excerpts from the 1999 and 2003 Welfare to Work studies as shown in Attachments 1 2, respectively. The proposed improvements eligible for JARC funding include services and facilities in the MTS and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas as well as potential programs and services run by health and human service agencies.

MTS has expressed a desire to expedite the FY 2006 allocation process for JARC grants. In order to award this money it is necessary to hold a competitive process open to MTS, NCTD, the CTSA, and other private and non-profit providers that might wish to provide services identified in the 2003 Welfare to Work Study.

**New Freedom Program**

The purpose of the New Freedom Program is to provide improved public transportation services and alternatives to public transportation for people with disabilities beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The program is designed to provide additional tools to overcome barriers facing Americans with disabilities who want to participate fully in society. Examples of projects and activities that might be funded under the program include, but are not limited to:

- Purchasing vehicles and supporting accessible taxi, ridesharing, and vanpooling programs.
- Providing paratransit services beyond minimum requirements (3/4 mile to either side of a fixed route), including for routes that run seasonally.
- Making accessibility improvements to transit and intermodal stations not designated as key stations.
• Supporting voucher programs for transportation services offered by human service providers.

• Supporting volunteer driver and aide programs.

• Supporting mobility management and coordination programs among public transportation providers and other human service agencies that provide transportation.

New Freedom money may be granted to projects or services for the disabled community that have been identified and vetted through a previous coordinated planning process. SANDAG believes that the coordinated planning activities of the CTSA fulfill this requirement for FY 2006. The CTSA has asked that a competitive process be held for the funds available in FY 2006.

Proposed FY 2006 Funding Process for JARC and New Freedom Programs

The FY 2006 competitive process for both programs would consist of a publicly noticed request for proposals, a public pre-proposal meeting, and an evaluation process. Successful projects would be funded only for one year. In September 2006, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provided draft guidance to help Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) such as SANDAG develop criteria for establishing priorities for selecting projects. Based on this guidance, it is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve the scoring criteria shown in Attachment 3 for the FY 2006 competitive process. Each proposal would be scored and ranked by staff using these criteria and a list of recommended projects would be submitted to the Transportation Committee.

The proposed scoring criteria that will be used to evaluate and rate project applications for JARC and New Freedom includes:

• Project Needs/Goals and Objectives
• Implementation Plan
• Project Budget
• Geographic Diversity
• Coordination & Program Outreach
• Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators
• Innovation

The FTA guidance also provides that the service operators (e.g. MTS CTSA, and NCTD) would not be eligible to participate in the evaluation and award process to ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

Proposed Schedule for FY 2006 Funding Process

The proposed schedule for the competitive process and grant award for FY 2006 JARC and New Freedom funding is shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Tentative Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approval of process and criteria by Transportation Committee</td>
<td>October 6, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advertisement of Request for Proposals</td>
<td>October 13, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public pre-proposal meetings</td>
<td>October 19 &amp; 20, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Closing date for receipt of proposals</td>
<td>November 16, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transportation Committee Approval of Grants</td>
<td>December 15, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTS, NCTD, and the CTSA have reviewed the proposed structure, schedule, and evaluation procedures for the FY 2006 competitive process and concur with the recommendations of this report.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. 1999 Welfare to Work Study Recommendations
2. 2003 Welfare to Work Study Recommendations
3. FY 2006 Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Funding & New Freedom Program
   Scoring Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
1999 WELFARE TO WORK STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix D

The projects listed below have been designated as either short term (one to two years) or long term (three to five years). The costs are intended to provide order of magnitude estimates; additional review and refinement should be conducted prior to implementation. Costs for New and Modified Transit Services are based on $2.50 per revenue mile.

NEW AND MODIFIED TRANSIT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours on selected routes past midnight</td>
<td>Operators</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase evening and weekend frequency on selected routes to 30 minutes</td>
<td>Operators</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend selected routes to improve connections to employment centers</td>
<td>Buses, Operators</td>
<td>Short-Long</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce new service in selected areas</td>
<td>Buses, Operators</td>
<td>Short-Long</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Routes 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 23, 33, 44, 55, 61, 65, 115, 301, 302, 313, 333, 334, 367, 602, 603, 701, 702, 816, 901, 903, 933, 934, 944, 951, 953, 963, 965, 986, 988, 987, 981, 982, 983, 974, 975, 932, 956
2 Routes 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 23, 33, 44, 55, 61, 65, 901, 903, 933, 934, 944, 951, 953, 963, 965, 986, 988, 987, 981, 982, 983, 974, 975, 932, 956
3 Other routes to be considered in the future: 16, 25, 51, 115, 303, 313, 314, 322, 331, 341, 344, 351, 352, 703A, 707, 712, 831, 833, 834, 854, 855, 856, 859, 856, 873. (Estimated cost - $500,000).
4 Elect National City, East Mission Valley, Serra Mesa/Mission Mesa
5 Mid-City/Scripps Mesa/University City, Kearny Mesa/Downtown San Diego, Sorrento Valley/Aliso Viejo Mesa/University City

COMPLEMENTARY TRANSIT STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop employer-based shuttles From transit centers</td>
<td>Vehicles, Operating Expenses</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>HHSA, Workforce Partnership</td>
<td>$250,000 per area served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop employer-based vanpools</td>
<td>Vehicles, Operating Expenses</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>HHSA, Workforce Partnership</td>
<td>$50,000 per vanpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide fare subsidies</td>
<td>Discounted Monthly Passes</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA, Workforce Partnership</td>
<td>$900,000 per 1000 clients for 50% discount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate safety features at bus stops and transit centers</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$800,000 for 100 stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand shuttles to support job search activities</td>
<td>Vehicles, Operating Expenses</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>HHSA, American Red Cross</td>
<td>$65,000 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take advantage of community-based transportation resources</td>
<td>Staffing (Inc. Dispatchers)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>American Red Cross (as the CTSA)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop bicycle donation program</td>
<td>Supply of Bicycles, Staff Training</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPROVED ACCESS TO INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train job counselors and caseworkers in transit trip planning</td>
<td>Staff and Materials</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA, MTDB, NCTD</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate internet access for counselors</td>
<td>Computers, Service Upgrades</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide transit mentoring for CaWORK's clients</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA, MTDB, NCTD, County Transit System</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand availability of transit information</td>
<td>Racks, Printing, Staff</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUTOMOBILE-BASED STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offset the high costs of obtaining an automobile</td>
<td>Loan Funds, Expenses, Administration</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Community-Based Organizations, HHSA</td>
<td>$15,000 per client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in employee vanpool programs</td>
<td>Vehicle, Operating Expenses</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA, SANDAG (RideLink)</td>
<td>$50,000 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guaranteed ride home program</td>
<td>Operating Expenses, Administration</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA, American Red Cross</td>
<td>$5,000 per client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PUBLIC POLICY CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate funding sources</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>SANDAG, American Red Cross (as the CTSA)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider simplifying fare structure</td>
<td>Staff, Consultant, Materials</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Transit Operators</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate day care at transit centers</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Short-Long</td>
<td>Cities, County, MTDB, NCTD, County Transit System</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue neighborhood-based employment strategies</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>County, Workforce Partnership</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the use of bicycles</td>
<td>Staff, Materials</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>HHSA</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2003 WELFARE TO WORK STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Proposal</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Subsidy Requirement (Preliminary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Existing Services</td>
<td>Extended hours of operation, weekend service, realignments, etc. to State Routes 30, 150, 603, 870, 877, 905, 921, 960, COASTER, and COASTER Connection.</td>
<td>Individual route costs range from $144,000 to $4,900,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Express Service</td>
<td>Interstate 805 (I-805) Express Service between University City/Sorrento Mesa and the U.S.-Mexico Border</td>
<td>$707,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Shuttle Service</td>
<td>Green Car connector in Kearny Mesa between transit center and employment sites</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improved Access to Transit Information | • Information pieces on www.sdcommute.com Web site for distribution to clients  
• Link www.sdcommute.com Web site to other Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) Web sites  
• Training sessions with caseworkers on use of Web site  
• Information in multiple languages for distribution in areas with concentrations of speakers | $5,000 Negligible $8,000 $15,000 |
| Improved Access to Transit Information cont. | • Add two telephone information operators to reduce wait times and lost calls  
• Include other languages in Trolley station and transit center signing  
• Provide Spanish language training to operators | $80,000 $30,000 $25,000 |
| Coordination with Social Service Providers for Green Car Service | Provide transit planner (1/4 time) to coordinate with providers and HHSA. | $12,500 |
| Guaranteed Ride Home Program | Provide vouchers for cab rides home for emergencies or unexpected situations during the work day. Model on express bus program. | $40,000 |
| Security Enhancements at Transit Centers | Provide security personnel and equipment at selected transit centers to facilitate use at off hours. Initial deployment would be at Euclid Avenue, 24th Street, and 12th & Imperial. | Personnel - $88,000 per station  
Equipment - $100,000 per station |
| Station Attendants | Provide transit information and directions to transit users at 12th & Imperial, America Plaza, Plaza Bonita, H Street, Iris, Old Town, Fashion Valley, Euclid, El Cajon Transit Center, Grossmont Center, and Santee. Attendants would be provided between 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., 365 days per year. | $30,500 per station |
FY 2006 JOBS ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE AND NEW FREEDOM FUNDING PROGRAM
SCORING CRITERIA

The following information and scoring criteria will be used to score and rate project applications for Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom (NF) funding for FY 2006.

a. Project Needs/Goals and Objectives (20 points): The project should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified through the locally developed human services transportation planning process, (e.g. 1999 or 2003 Welfare to Work Studies) or are otherwise based on a documented assessment of needs within the designated communities of concern. Project application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project is consistent with the objectives of the JARC and NF grant programs.

b. Implementation Plan (20 points): For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, and describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The project application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Project sponsors should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of JARC and NF funds for this purpose, and demonstrate that no other sources of funds are available to meet this need. Also, provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.

c. Project Budget (15 points): Projects must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Proposals should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period. Proponent shall demonstrate how using this funding leverages resources to the maximum possible extent.

d. Geographic Diversity (15 points): Projects should ensure a geographic distribution of benefits to encourage some level of diverse geographic disbursement across the urbanized portion of the County.

e. Coordination and Program Outreach (15 points): Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources. Project sponsors should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project. Project sponsors should also describe how they would promote public awareness of the project. Letters of support from key stakeholders should be attached to the grant application.
f. Program Effectiveness and Performance Indicators (10 points): The project will be scored based on the project sponsor’s ability to demonstrate that the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service delivery to the need, and is a cost-effective approach. Project sponsors must also identify clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures to track the effectiveness of the service in meeting the identified goals. A plan should be provided for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved. Sponsor should describe their steps to measure the effectiveness and magnitude of the impact that the project will have on low-income residents.

g. Innovation (5 points): Provides new or innovative service concepts or facilities that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the target populations and may have future application elsewhere in the region.
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TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET TRANSFERS

Introduction

SANDAG implements projects on behalf of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). These projects are included in the SANDAG Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Program Budget. In accordance with SANDAG’s Delegation of Authority policy, the Executive Director has the authority to approve budget transfers between capital projects up to $100,000. The Transportation Committee has the authority to approve these transactions up to $500,000. The requested budget transfers total $232,840, which requires Transportation Committee approval in accordance with SANDAG policy. This item recommends budget transfers between seven projects as discussed below. On September 14, 2006, the MTS Board of Directors recommended approval of these budget transfers.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve budget transfers as described in Table 1 below for seven capital projects: (1) Chula Vista Transit (CVT) Miscellaneous Operation Capital FY 2004; (2) CVT Miscellaneous Operation Capital FY 2005; (3) CVT ADA Bus Stop Improvements; (4) CVT Security Cameras; (5) CVT Forklift; (6) MTS Regional Miscellaneous Capital FY 2006; and (7) CCTV Surveillance Equipment. This action will provide funds to install closed-circuit television cameras at three trolley stations in Chula Vista.

Discussion

SANDAG is the grant recipient for federal formula transit capital funds distributed to the region; therefore, SANDAG includes a number of transit capital projects in its Program Budget. These funds provide for capital improvements for regional transit operators including MTS and Chula Vista Transit (CVT). Because of security concerns at three trolley stations in Chula Vista, CVT and MTS propose to revise capital project funding approved in the SANDAG Program Budget to fund the installation of closed-circuit television cameras (CCTVs) at these stations. The proposed transfer would move $232,840 out of six projects to increase the budget of the CCTV Surveillance Equipment Project. The transfers come from projects that were completed with a remaining balance in the budget, are lower-priority projects not yet started, or are Miscellaneous Operations Capital projects which typically are reserved to fund unanticipated capital expenditures.
At its September 14, 2006, meeting, the MTS Board approved an item recommending these budget transfers. Table 1 below summarizes the requested budget actions. The budget actions in lines 1 through 5 would transfer a total of $220,423 in funds from projects in the SANDAG Program Budget to the CCTV Surveillance Equipment Project (line 7), which is included in the MTS approved budget. Budget action in line 6 would transfer $12,417 in funds from an MTS project budget into the above-mentioned CCTV project. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve all these actions because the cumulative change exceeds $100,000 and all the projects are funded out of SANDAG administered grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CVT Misc. Operations Capital FY 2004 (1107400)</td>
<td>$67,488</td>
<td>$63,784</td>
<td>-$3,704 (-5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CVT Misc. Operations Capital FY 2005 (1111400)</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$3,622</td>
<td>-$22,378 (-86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CVT ADA Bus Stop Improvements (1111600)</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$23,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CVT Security Cameras (1111700)</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$164,000 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CVT Forklift (1111800)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$27,659</td>
<td>-$7,341 (-21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regional Misc. Capital FY 2006 (11147)</td>
<td>$561,286</td>
<td>$548,869</td>
<td>-$12,417 (-2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CCTV Surveillance Equipment (11166)</td>
<td>$735,000</td>
<td>$967,840</td>
<td>$232,840 (+32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JACK BODA  
Director of Mobility Management and Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
Introduction

SANDAG, in partnership with the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the California Highway Patrol (CHP), has implemented a demonstration project to evaluate the effectiveness of using the freeway shoulder lanes as a low-speed transit priority measure when the regular freeway lanes are congested. As originally outlined in an item taken to the SANDAG Transportation Committee at its October 21, 2005, meeting (Attachment 1), this one-year demonstration project was implemented on State Route 52 (SR 52)/Interstate 805 (I-805) between Kearny Mesa and University City using MTS Express Route 960 (see map in Attachment 1).

To date, the demonstration project has proven successful at meeting the objectives in terms of safety, benefits to transit operations, bus driver and passenger perceptions, freeway level of service/maintenance, and shoulder lane structural issues.

Discussion

Increasing congestion on arterial streets and freeways impacts public transportation operations in a number of ways: adding travel time, reducing on-time performance, and increased operating costs. Finding ways to bypass that congestion through the use of transit priority measures offers the potential to mitigate these problems as well increase the attractiveness of transit as an alternative to the automobile, especially during peak travel times. SANDAG, working with its two transit operators, MTS and the North County Transit District (NCTD), has successfully implemented a number of arterial queue jump lanes and is working on several rapid bus corridor projects that would employ a wide range of transit priority measures ranging from signal priority treatments to dedicated transit lanes.

For the freeway system that is used by a number of existing express bus and commuter express bus services and future BRT lines, our regional Managed Lanes/High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes system outlined in MOBILITY 2030 will offer high-speed transit priority travel, along with direct access ramps to adjacent freeway BRT stations. Since the Managed Lanes projects are longer-term solutions, there is a need for short-term priority measures to facilitate existing express services and additional routes planned for implementation in the next several years. Use of freeway shoulder lanes by transit vehicles as a low-speed bypass of congested freeway lanes offers that potential. Freeway shoulder lanes projects have successfully been used in Minneapolis since 1992, and have been implemented in several other cities in recent years.
The intent of the freeway transit lane demonstration project is to gain local operational experience in the use of existing shoulder lanes during the peak periods. SR 52 and I-805 were chosen for the demonstration project due to its relatively wide shoulder widths and heavy peak-period congestion levels.

On December 5, 2005, the freeway demonstration project was implemented on Route 960, a commuter express bus route operating between the Euclid Trolley Station/Mid-City and job centers in Kearny Mesa and University City. This report provides an update on the performance of the demonstration project through its first six months of operation.

**Project Objectives**

Experience gained through the implementation of this project will be used to assess the ability to use freeway transit lanes in other corridors where existing express services and future BRT services will operate. The demonstration project is assessing five key questions. These are identified below, along with a summary of the performance for the first six months of operation indicated.

- **Safety** – Is there any change in accident rates with buses using the transit-only lanes, and do CHP officers and Caltrans maintenance crews experience safety-related problems?
  
  To date, there have been no accidents that have occurred as a result of the demonstration project. We have surveyed both Caltrans and the CHP to determine if there have been issues related to Highway Patrol enforcement or Caltrans maintenance activities. None have been noted, and all the partners in the project have indicated that there have been no operational issues associated with the shoulder lane operation.

- **Bus Travel Time and Reliability** – Do buses experience a measurable and repeatable time savings and enhanced trip reliability (on-time performance)?
  
  SANDAG staff performed on-time travel checks during May 2006. All of the trips on Route 960 reported a 99 percent on-time performance, meaning that nearly all buses operating along the freeway shoulder lane demonstration project got into the terminal at Westfield UTC (formerly University Towne Centre) at or before the time shown on the timetable.

  In addition to the travel time checks, in May 2006, SANDAG undertook a test of the travel time savings between buses operating in the shoulder lane versus a car operating in the regular freeway travel lanes. The day of the test saw significant morning commute congestion along westbound SR 52 leading to northbound I-805. The result of the bus using the shoulder lane to bypass this congestion resulted in a five-minute faster travel time versus the automobile trip. While this result was for only that particular surveyed trip, it does provide a dramatic example of the benefits that a freeway shoulder lane program can offer to transit operations when there is significant traffic congestion in the main travel lanes.
Bus Driver and Passenger Perceptions - Do bus drivers feel safe using the transit-only lanes and are auto drivers comfortable with buses merging in and out of the transit-only lanes? Also, do transit riders perceive improved travel time and trip reliability and do they feel safe with the bus operating in the transit-only lane?

SANDAG Technical Assistance staff conducted a survey of drivers and passengers before the demonstration project was implemented, and then conducted a follow up survey after the demonstration project had been in place for six months. The results of the two surveys are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This route generally runs on time</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion is a daily problem for this route</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers do a good job on this route</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the freeway shoulder is a good idea</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the freeway shoulder (will) saves time</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (will) feel safe with the bus driving on the shoulder</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Drivers</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers can count on route being on time</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion is a problem on route</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a good route to drive</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the freeway shoulder is a good idea</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the freeway shoulder is safe</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the freeway shoulder (will) improved travel time</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been adequately trained to operate on the freeway</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Driver training on the route was done after the implementation of the survey. Driver training involved eight hours of classroom training and two hours of field training.

The results show that all categories shown in the “After” survey showed an improved rating by passengers and drivers alike regarding the demonstration project. Passengers, who were very positive about the benefits of the program before it began, were even more positive after having experienced riding on the freeway shoulder during periods of heavy congestion. Approximately 90 percent of transit passengers believe operating on the freeway shoulder saves time, with more than 70 percent estimating a travel time savings of five minutes or more. Safety has been a key concern for all agencies involved in this project. In contrast, passengers believed the project would be safe before it began and an even higher percent (90 percent) feel safe now that the buses are actually operating on the freeway shoulder.
While a bit more cautious about than transit passengers, transit drivers are still positive overall about the safety and benefits of the demonstration project. As with passengers, transit drivers responded much more positively to the evaluation questions in the “After” survey. In the “Before” survey drivers took a much more “wait and see” approach to the demonstration project. While driver perception of traffic congestion on the Route 960 is somewhat worse now, drivers indicated that the route is now more likely to be on time. While still rated positively, the areas of biggest concern to drivers are safety, ability to reduce travel time, and training for operating on the freeway shoulder. When asked what other routes might benefit from operating on the freeway shoulder, the Route 905 was mentioned most often.

- Freeway Level of Service and Maintenance – Is there any reduction in freeway levels of service from the transit-only lanes, and is there an increased level of maintenance required?

SANDAG staff has contacted the CHP, Caltrans, and MTS to determine how the shoulders are performing with buses operating in them. Both CHP and Caltrans have indicated that there have been no changes in the shoulder or freeway levels of service based on visual-based surveys and in talking with people in the field. MTS has indicated the need for additional shoulder maintenance due to the trash and other freeway debris that accumulate in the shoulders. We are evaluating contracting for additional shoulder maintenance to improve the condition of the shoulders.

- Structural Changes to the Shoulder – What kind of structural changes will be required to make the demonstration project feasible?

During the planning stages of this project, we had determined that shoulder widening would be required along portions of SR 52 to allow for a 10-foot shoulder. This would provide the buses with an optimal travel lane.

Further analysis of the shoulder lane and actual operation of the buses have shown that we can safely operate in a smaller shoulder without compromising safety. Therefore, the shoulders were never restriped to a wider lane. For the demonstration project, there are no plans to restripe unless it becomes a safety concern. Significant signage has been positioned along the shoulder, and more signage is on-order per a request from the CHP. Discussions with bus drivers do indicate that the narrow shoulders in certain locations make passing larger vehicles somewhat more difficult. While this has not posed safety problems, it does slow transit operations. Should the demonstration project be made a permanent program, widening the lanes would provide a more optimal environment for buses to bypass vehicles in the congested main lanes.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Based on the first six months of operation, SANDAG, MTS, Caltrans, and the CHP agree that the demonstration project to test the viability of transit vehicles using the shoulder lanes as a low-speed priority measure has been successful. We will continue to monitor the demonstration project over the coming months (the formal demonstration project continues through December 2006) and will report back to the Transportation Committee after the one-year demonstration period. We do not expect any problems.
Given the success to date, the next step is to begin looking at other applications for freeway shoulder lanes projects. Towards this end, a variety of issue areas will be examined:

- Develop a working list of other corridors that could benefit from this procedure
- Undertake a cost/benefit analysis for these corridors that would compare the capital costs versus the benefits received
- Develop a list of structural requirements for shoulder use
- Follow up on legislative changes required to make the demonstration project a permanent program

SANDAG will continue the working group with Caltrans, MTS, and CHP to address these issues over the next year.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Item 7 - Freeway Transit Lane Demonstration Project, from October 21, 2005, Transportation Committee meeting

Key Staff Contact: Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
FREeway TRANSIT LANE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Introduction

Over the past several years, SANDAG has been working toward increasing the speed and effectiveness of public transportation throughout the region. Over the long term, our Regional Transportation Plan calls for implementation of Managed Lanes and high occupancy vehicle facilities. Since these facilities will take a number of years to plan, design, and construct, we have been searching for an interim strategy for bypassing congested freeway corridors for existing commuter express bus services and our TransNet early action Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes.

A promising solution is an innovative concept that would allow the use of freeway shoulders as a transit priority measure. Used successfully in Minneapolis since 1992, the use of shoulders as a low-speed bypass of congested freeway lanes offers a low-cost, easily implementable strategy that will increase transit operating speeds, on-time performance, and trip reliability.

Working closely with our partners at the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol (CHP), we are pleased to report that we will initiate a one-year demonstration project for Express Route 960 along the State Route 52 (SR 52)/Interstate 805 (I-805) corridor between Kearny Mesa and University City (see Attachment 1) starting in late October/early November.

As with any new idea, there have been a number of issues to address. The fact that these issues were satisfactorily resolved to allow us to implement the demonstration shows a strong willingness of our partners to explore innovative concepts for easing the impacts of congestion on our region. During the one-year demonstration period, substantial monitoring will be done to ascertain our ability to apply this concept to other corridors in the region. In addition, using the freeway shoulders in the planned Managed Lanes corridors will help build ridership patterns for future BRT routes.

Discussion

The intent of the freeway transit lane demonstration project is to gain local operational experience with the conversion of existing shoulder lanes to transit lanes during the peak periods. SR 52 and I-805 were chosen for the demonstration project due to sufficient shoulder widths and heavy peak-period congestion levels.
SANDAG staff has worked with MTS, Caltrans, and the CHP to develop an operating plan and gain mutual consensus on the goals of the project.

**Project Objectives**

Experience gained through the implementation of this project will be used to assess the ability to use freeway transit lanes in other corridors where existing express services and future BRT services will operate. The demonstration project will assess five key objectives.

- **Safety** – Is there any change in accident rates with buses using the transit-only lanes, and do CHP officers and Caltrans’ maintenance crews experience safety-related problems?

  To gauge this we will evaluate accident data and meet with CHP staff throughout the process. SANDAG will also have trained staff on-board routinely to evaluate how the shoulders are operating and documenting any hazards or obstructions. Prior to the implementation of the project, Caltrans and SANDAG staff will videotape the shoulders and undertake a minor capital project to develop signage and re-striping for the shoulder.

- **Bus Travel Time and Reliability** – Do buses experience a measurable and repeatable time savings and enhanced trip reliability (on-time performance)?

  SANDAG staff will monitor the performance of the route throughout the demonstration period. We are currently creating extensive baseline data for how the route is operating pre-demonstration; this includes collecting the baseline on-time performance, ridership, and accident data to do comparative analysis after the demonstration program is in place.

- **Bus Driver and Passenger Perceptions** – Do bus drivers feel safe using the transit-only lanes and are auto drivers comfortable with buses merging in and out of the transit-only lanes? Also, do transit riders perceive improved travel time and trip reliability and do they feel safe with the bus operating in the transit-only lane?

  SANDAG’s Technical Services staff will be undertaking before and after surveys of bus drivers and passengers to determine their current perception of how the service operates versus how the route is operating after the demonstration period has started.

- **Level of Service and Maintenance** – Is there any reduction in freeway levels of service from the transit-only lanes, and is there an increased level of maintenance required?

  Caltrans staff will be providing ongoing freeway loop data that will be used to evaluate the flow of main lane traffic. Information will be gained to assess if there are any impacts to main lane traffic as a result of the freeway transit lane demonstration project. In addition, SANDAG will be working with the CHP, Caltrans, and the Freeway Service Patrol contractors to maintain a clear shoulder for bus operations.
• Capital Improvements - What kinds of physical improvements to shoulder lanes would be required if this concept were to be implemented permanently?

For the demonstration project, only minor improvements will be made to the shoulder. Sections will be re-striped to provide a wider shoulder. Significant signage will also be positioned along the corridor.

Additional Implementation/Monitoring Activities

• Driver Training - MTS and SANDAG have developed an extensive driver training program. All Route 960 drivers will receive four hours of classroom training, two hours on-the-road training, and refresher training throughout the demonstration period. New drivers will be trained as they are hired.

• Marketing - A marketing plan has been developed which includes extensive radio spots, print media, a Web page, “Take-One” notices on the buses, and outreach to agencies in the demonstration area.

• Public Agency Outreach - Fire, police, and other essential support agencies in the corridor are scheduled to be briefed on the demonstration project in October. In addition, an outreach letter will be sent to other public and private transportation operators in the corridor. The purpose of this letter will be to let them know of the parameters of the demonstration project and ensure that no copycat use of the transit-only lanes occurs.

• Project Team Meetings - Beginning in October, the project team, which includes SANDAG, Caltrans, CHP, and MTS staff, will hold bi-weekly meetings to coordinate the implementation of the project. After implementation, this group will meet monthly or as often as needed.

• Monitoring Reports - Every quarter SANDAG staff will bring a report to the Transportation Committee and MTS Board outlining the status of the freeway shoulder lane project. This report will include the following data:

  - Safety (accidents, obstructions, CHP comments);
  - Main lane operations (loop data assessing how the main lanes are operating);
  - Bus Operations and Ridership (On-time performance data and ridership data); and
  - Survey results (bus driver and passenger perception surveys).

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Map of Demonstration Project Area

Key Staff Contact: Jennifer Williamson, (619) 699-1959, jwil@sandag.org
Good morning Chair Kellejian, board members, staff, and other fellow citizens. Chuck Lungerhausen of 5308 Monroe Ave. #124 which is in the SDSU neighborhood of San Diego. 92115 Phone 619-546-5610.

Have to correct the minutes of the Sept 01 meeting. I am in favor of a new stadium at the Qualcomm site because the tax payers of the county through the TransNet Tax have made it possible for the Trolley to serve that location. How we pay for that new stadium is a good question. That stadium through the Holiday Bowl and most recently added Poinsettia Bowl has presented this area in a very favorable light and may have attracted some of our present employers of the region. Changing the location of the stadium is not in the best interests of us taxpayers.

Will also point out that stadium is used every year for various high school football play-offs plus other uses like truck pull contests or moto-cross competition for motor bikes and any number of other uses in other words it has been a huge asset to the region.

Thank you for listening and the opportunity to speak
Annual Process

- Develop regional list of high priority transportation projects
- Submit list to federal delegation
- Congress considers requests during annual appropriations process
Recent History

- Congress facing competing funding needs
- Overall appropriations down significantly compared to prior year
- Earmark reform under discussion

Appropriations Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 2004</th>
<th>Actual FY 2005</th>
<th>Actual FY 2006</th>
<th>Pending FY 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-FFGA</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGA</td>
<td>$111.2</td>
<td>$135.5</td>
<td>$19.9</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$121.1</td>
<td>$153.3</td>
<td>$32.6</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed FY 2008 Selection Process

Eligibility Criteria
1. Project is in Regional Transportation Plan
2. Project has non-federal match
3. Requested funds can be obligated in FY 2008

Evaluation Criteria
1. In construction and needs funds
2. Ready to advertise
3. Environmentally cleared
4. Improves security and safety
5. Protects investment in infrastructure
**Schedule**

- **October 2006**: Approval of process & criteria
- **December 2006**: Project proposals due
- **January 2007**: Approval of FY 2008 project list
- **February–March 2007**: Meet with delegation & submit requests

**Recommendation**

Discuss and approve process and criteria for selecting transportation projects for FY 2008 federal appropriations cycle
Hello Deborah,

I'm out of town at the moment, so I shall re-type my comments for the October 6 Transportation Committee meeting, below:

To Transportation Committee Members,

I have read the Agenda and attachments for the October 6 meeting wherein was suggested that the Interstate 15 BRT service should be "branded".

I suggest the BRT service be named: "Centre City Express" or "Centre City Flyer" or even just "Centre City Line", since the service will connect the cities of Escondido and San Diego whose downtown areas have historically been called "Centre City". Besides being historically correct, any of the three-names mentioned above would provide a strong regional flavor and some cachet to the service, much like the names "San Diego Trolley" and "Coaster" provide in their respective service areas. Importantly, anyone using the service will surely know what is to be their ultimate destination.

I think it is particularly instructive to see how the Trolley name came about, and how it was embraced by the citizens over suggestions to name it something like "Metro". In my opinion, "Metro" could be anywhere USA, but "Trolley" is San Diego. The same, I believe applies to my suggestion for the I-15 BRT.

Respectfully yours,

Doug Scott
San Diego
1.619.238.4278
October 6, 2005

SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street, Ste. 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Committee members:

I was extremely disappointed to learn from SANDAG staff only last Thursday that the plans for completing the BRT stations at Sabre Springs and Rancho Bernardo are proposed to be delayed until 2012.

Staff indicated various reasons for the delay of the stations’ completion, from not knowing what types of BRT buses to purchase, to additional environmental studies needed for the parking structures. The fact remains that both the Rancho Bernardo and Sabre Springs Stations were designed to accommodate parking structures, and as such, the stations should be completed as scheduled, and in a manner that can accommodate for the future construction of the parking structures and BRT vehicles.

While I am content that the managed lanes and direct access ramps will be available to commuters by its original deadline of December 2007, I have yet to hear why this “BRT operations concept”, which is the primary catalyst for the delay, was not done five or more years ago.

I respectfully request that the Transportation Committee do everything possible to prevent any further construction delays of these two stations. Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

[Brian Maienschein]
Brian Maienschein
Councilmember

BKM:kn
I-15 Corridor

- 2006: COA Changes
- 2007: SPRINTER
- 2007/08: Middle Segment
  - 2007/08: Existing Routes Use 3 Stations
- 2011: North Segment
  - 2010/11: Existing Routes Use Escondido Transit Center and Direct Access Ramp
- 2012: South Segment
  - 2012: Full BRT Service
  - 2012: Transit Priority South of SR 163
Service Plan for 2008 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Route</th>
<th>Frequency (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 / 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>15 / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRT Demand
**Analysis**

- Potential market within 2 ½ miles of main corridor.
- Predominant access to BRT expected to be auto.
- Remote parking sites are limited.

**Findings**

- Access should be focused at BRT stations, allowing for high level of service.
- Additional parking capacity needed at stations.

**Option 1 - 2012 BRT Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency (minutes)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Wkend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido-Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo-Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Mountain-Downtown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(option)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Penasquitos-Downtown (option)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 1 Service Concept

- **Core BRT**
  - (15 min peak/30 min offpeak)

- **Escondido Peak BRT**
  - (10 min peak only)

- **Rancho Bernardo Peak BRT**
  - (10 min peak only)

- **Rancho Penasquitos Peak BRT - Option**
  - (30 min peak only)

- **Carmel Mountain Peak BRT - Option**
  - (30 min peak only)

### Option 2 - 2012 BRT Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido-Downtown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo-Downtown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido-Sorrento Valley/University City</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 2 Service Concept

Estimated Annual Operating and Maintenance Funds - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>(millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current I-15 Operations</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FasTrak</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Corridor BRT Stations

Interim: 2008-2011
Ultimate: 2012

- **Escondido Transit Center**
  - Interim: Curbside Bus Stops
  - Ultimate: Parking Structure (Center for Performing Arts as backup)

- **Del Lago**
  - Interim: Existing Park and Ride
  - Ultimate: Kit Carson Park for Carpools

- **Rancho Bernardo**
  - Interim: Curbside Bus Stops, Parking,
  - Ultimate: Parking Structure (RB church is backup)

- **Sabre Springs**
  - Interim: Curbside Bus Stop, Parking
  - Ultimate: Parking Structure (Branch to Rancho Penas. Or Carmel Mountain is backup)

- **Mira Mesa**
  - Interim:
  - Ultimate: Parking Structure w/ College

---

**Capital Funds**

$370 million in TransNet capital funds for
- Stations
- Vehicles
- Direct Access Ramps

Items such as parking structures and maintenance facility are not included.
Ongoing Work

- Improvements south of SR 163
- Determine best station(s) for Riverside ridership
- BRT Maintenance Facility
- Vehicle Procurement
- Station Maintenance
- Branding and Marketing
- Feeder Bus Service
- Phasing in Sorrento Mesa service
- Continue to work with MTS, NCTD, and Caltrans to detail service concept and address funding opportunities

Recommendation

Approve initial I-15 BRT operations concept that includes:

- Using Interim BRT stations between 2008 and 2012 to improve access to and operations of existing I-15 services
- Launching full BRT services in 2012 concurrent with completion of the north I-15 ML/BRT facilities

Staff will continue to evaluate parking structures at BRT stations and funding options.
Proposed Changes to I-15 FasTrak Program and Amended and Restated MOU with MTS for I-15 Transit Services

Transportation Committee
Item No. 7
October 6, 2006

Presentation Overview

- Background
- Traffic and Toll Trends
- Proposed Changes
- Recommendations
What is I-15 FasTrak?

- Award-winning I-15 FasTrak road pricing began in 1998
- Provides solo drivers access to carpool lanes for a fee
- First project of its kind—sets fees dynamically to keep traffic free flowing
- Original fee structure approved in 1997 established a minimum ($0.50) and maximum ($8.00) per-trip fee

Purpose of Program

- Increase use of existing underutilized carpool lanes
- Use toll revenue to fund transit improvements in the corridor
- Relieve mainline congestion and improve travel choices in the corridor
Corridor Transit Services

Current Services
• Inland Breeze
• Commuter and Local Express services
• Restructuring based on COA

2008-2011
• Existing Services to take advantage of ML/BRT facilities

2012
• Full BRT Service

Changing Conditions

• Construction of I-15 Managed Lanes

• Opening of SR 56

Express Lanes traffic declined 30 percent from 2004 to 2006
Increasing Costs

- Aging toll system
  - Nearly 10 years old
  - Due for replacement in 2007

- Enforcement
  - Provided by CHP on overtime basis
  - 5% per year average increase in hourly rate (2001 to 2006)
Business Considerations

• Parity with other FasTrak toll roads and bridges

• Steady growth in new customer enrollments

Customer Service Options

By phone  Walk-in  & Web

I-15 FasTrak Net Revenue and Transit Pass-Thru

Before SR 56  After SR 56

Fiscal Year

2001  2002  2003  2004  2005  2006

$0  $500,000  $1,000,000  $1,500,000  $2,000,000  $2,500,000  $3,000,000  $3,500,000  $4,000,000  $4,500,000  $5,000,000  $5,500,000  $6,000,000  $6,500,000  $7,000,000  $7,500,000  $8,000,000  $8,500,000  $9,000,000  $9,500,000  $10,000,000  $10,500,000  $11,000,000  $11,500,000
I-15 FasTrak Net Revenue and Transit Pass-Thru

Before SR 56

After SR 56

Net Revenue From Tolls
Transit Pass Thru

Fiscal Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006

Operating Reserves are Declining
(Previous Years Reserves plus Net Revenue from Tolls minus Pass-thru)

$1,485,914
$1,136,025
$(201,327)
$160,840*
$(400,000)
$(200,000)
$200,000
$400,000
$600,000
$800,000
$1,000,000
$1,200,000
$1,400,000
$1,600,000

2005 2006 2007 2008

Critical Operating Reserve

* Transit Pass-thru of $800,000 in 2007, $0 in 2008

Operating Reserve
Actual: Forecast:
Proposed Changes

- Two changes are proposed to raise additional revenue:
  1. Charge a monthly account fee
  2. Raise the minimum toll rate
- Several alternatives analyzed for each:
  - Calculated price sensitivity
  - Tested various price increments
  - Marketing promotions

Proposed Change 1: Charge Monthly Account Fee

- High proportion of FasTrak accounts do not actively use the lanes
- Each account costs SANDAG $3.23 per month per customer.
- Similar fees exist for other FasTrak agencies
- Design fee to motivate use
- Analyzed account fees from $2 to $5 per account
Account Fee’s Effect on Revenue and Transactions Lost

Recommended amount: $3.50
Proposed Change 2: Increase Minimum Toll Rate

- SANDAG has never modified the minimum toll rate
- Existing $0.50 minimum toll equals $0.06/mile
- Comparable facilities charge between $0.10 and $0.30/mile
- Analyzed impacts of several options to increase minimum toll rate

Increasing Toll Charge’s Effect on Revenue and Transactions

- Graph showing the relationship between toll charges and transactions lost.
- Transactions lost increase as toll charges increase.
- Key point: 169,806 transactions lost at a $2.00 toll charge.
Increasing Toll Charge's Effect on Revenue and Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toll Charges</th>
<th>Transactions Lost</th>
<th>Revenue Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>169,806</td>
<td>-15,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>114,157</td>
<td>35,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>62,320</td>
<td>72,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>27,556</td>
<td>107,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>14,166</td>
<td>141,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>175,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended minimum: $1.25

Summary

Proposed Changes:

- Increase minimum toll rate to $1.25
- Add a new account fee of $3.50 per month

Expected Outcomes:

- Maintain critical operating reserve of $200,000 annually
- Fund transit in FY2007 for $800,000 and in FY2008 for $500,000
- Fund transit in FY2009-FY2011 at a minimum of $500,000 annually
Recommendation

Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors:

(1) Approve Resolution No. 2007-08 concerning updated FasTrak Value Pricing Policy and proposed changes (to take effect 11/01/2006)

(2) Authorize Executive Director to execute amended and restated MOU/Fund Transfer Agreement with MTS for continued funding of I-15 transit services
JARC & New Freedom

Transportation Committee
October 6, 2006

SAFETEA-LU Overview

- Congress passed in August 2005
- Extended Job Access & Reverse Commute Program (JARC)
- Created New Freedom Program (NF)
- Requires a Coordinated Public Transit & Human Services Transportation Plan
- SANDAG designated recipient for urbanized areas
Urban Areas Only

Process for FY 2006

- Projects selected from existing Plans
- Outreach in October
- Submissions in November
- Recommendations and submission to FTA by end of year
- One year grants
Process for FY 2007

• Projects must be derived from Coordinated Plan
• Federal guidance expected by January 2007
• Grants may be for 1 or 2 years
• Last year is FY 2009

Available Funds

• FY 2006 San Diego Urbanized Area
  – JARC - $1.4 million
  – New Freedom - $672,000
• Local match required
• SANDAG may claim up to 10% to develop plan and administer
Coordinated Plan

- SANDAG will develop Coordinated Plan as part of development of Regional Short Range Transit Plan
- Must include public, private, non-profit sectors in development of plan

Competitive Selection

- Competitive process is separate from planning process
- Outreach to all potential providers
  - Mail out
  - Web site
  - Two public meetings
  - Media outreach
New Freedom

- Funding for services beyond those required by ADA
- Enhancing fixed route services that cater to persons with disabilities is included
- Improve accessibility at existing facilities if improvements not already planned

New Freedom Examples

- Purchasing accessible vehicles
- Administering voucher programs
- Administering volunteer drivers/aides
- Supporting Mobility Management programs
- Travel training for individual users
- Improving and extending complimentary ADA services
JARC

• Existing services may continue, but must be in an existing plan
• Previous SANDAG Welfare to Work Studies identify projects
• Projects must be competitively selected
• Transit agencies & others are eligible

JARC Examples

• Late night and weekend fixed route service
• Guaranteed ride home service
• Vanpools, regional mobility management
• Ridesharing & carpooling activities
• Cycling programs & car sharing
• ITS, information and dispatch systems
• Promotion/Marketing/Pass programs
JARC/NF Selection Criteria

- Project Need, Goals & Objectives
- Implementation Plan
- Project Budget
- Coordination & Program Outreach
- Geographic Diversity
- Program Effectiveness
- Innovation

Recommendations

Approve:

- SANDAG to hold a competitive process to award FY 2006 grants
- Award funding based on proposed criteria
JARC & New Freedom

Transportation Committee
October 6, 2006
Transit Capital Project
Budget Transfers

October 6, 2006

New CCTV Installation Locations

Blue Line
- Bayfront/E St.
- H Street
- Palomar Street

Chula Vista

This Property Protected by Surveillance Cameras
## Recommended Budget Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CVT Misc. Operations Capital FY 04</td>
<td>$67,488</td>
<td>$63,784</td>
<td>-$3,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CVT Misc. Operations Capital FY 05</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$3,622</td>
<td>-$22,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CVT ADA Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CVT Security Cameras</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-$164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CVT Forklift</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$27,659</td>
<td>-$7,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regional Misc. Capital FY 06</td>
<td>$561,286</td>
<td>$548,869</td>
<td>-$12,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CCTV Surveillance Equipment</td>
<td>$735,000</td>
<td>$967,840</td>
<td>$232,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Freeway Transit Lane Demonstration Project

Project Description

- Intent has to gain operational experience with conversion of shoulders to transit lanes as a low-speed priority
- Has a cooperative effort between SANDAG, MTS, Caltrans, and the Highway Patrol
- One-year demonstration started in December 2005
- Concept patterned after successful program in Minneapolis
Freeway Transit Lane Demonstration Project

Freeway Transit Lanes Demo
SR 52 / I-805

- SR 52/I-805 Shoulder Lane Project
- Route 960 Alignment
- Existing Transit Center
- Proposed Transit Center

Video of bus on shoulder operations
Key Objectives

• **Safety** –
  Any change in accident rates or other safety issues?

• **Bus Travel Time/Reliability** –
  Any change in travel times & trip reliability?

• **Freeway Level of Service/Maintenance** –
  Any reduction in freeway level of service or increased maintenance needs?

• **Structural Changes to Shoulder** –
  What kinds of improvements to shoulders might be needed if program were made permanent?

• **Perceptions** –
  Do bus drivers and transit passengers feel safe?

Performance To Date

• **Safety**
  – No accidents have occurred
  – No issues related to CHP enforcement or Caltrans maintenance

• **Bus Travel Time & Reliability**
  – Route 960 buses = 99% on-time performance
  – Up to 5 minutes travel time savings for buses during heavy congestion

• **Freeway Level of Service & Maintenance**
  – CHP & Caltrans report no changes in freeway levels of service
  – MTS indicates need for additional maintenance to remove debris in shoulders
Performance To Date

- **Structural Changes**
  - 10-foot shoulder width optimal
  - Buses can safely operate in narrower shoulder, but it does slow operations

- **Perceptions**
  - Before and after surveys conducted
  - All categories show improved rating in “After” survey
    - Transit Drivers:
      - 72%: use of shoulders is safe
      - 86%: use of shoulders a good idea
    - Transit Passengers:
      - 91%: use of shoulders provide travel time savings
      - 90%: feel safe with bus in shoulders

Conclusions and Next Steps

- **Continue to monitor the Demo Project**
- **Evaluate other applications for shoulder lane projects**
  - Follow up on legislative changes to make demo project a permanent program
  - Develop working list of other corridors
  - Undertake cost / benefit analysis
  - List shoulder structural requirements
Freeway Transit Lane Demonstration Project