TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Friday, November 3, 2006
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• DRAFT 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES

• PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

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

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ITEM #

1. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 20, 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. CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE (Linda Culp)

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California’s major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor the work of the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

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

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

**REPORTS (5 through 10)**

5. DRAFT 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Rachel Kennedy)

Performance measures are utilized to provide performance comparisons of distinct transportation network scenarios in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and to monitor progress towards meeting the Plan’s policy goals and objectives. The Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC) was established to examine and update the transportation project evaluation criteria and performance measures for the 2007 RTP. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the draft performance measures recommended by the TPEC for use in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan.
+6. FY 2007 TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT
(Kim York)

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the transfer of $200,216 from the indicated capital projects to the Metropolitan Transit System FY 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to cover the CIP funding shortfall.

+7. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT * (Jim Linthicum, SANDAG; Tom Lichterman, NCTD)

This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures and SANDAG’s independent assessment of the project. North County Transit District and SANDAG staffs will summarize recent progress on the project.

+8. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM
(Craig Scott and José A. Nuncio)

The Transportation Committee is asked to discuss the SPRINTER financial plan options and provide comments or direction to staff regarding the proposed concept of amending the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan to include the completion of the SPRINTER project, which would add this project to the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP). With only one Transportation Committee meeting in November, this issue could be going forward to the Board of Directors as early as the November 17, 2006, meeting without another opportunity for input from the Transportation Committee. In addition, the Transportation Committee should provide any comments on the proposed revisions to the EAP to add funding for the Environmental Mitigation Program and capital improvements to the Trolley.

+9. COST IMPLICATIONS OF NEW EMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR OFF-ROAD DIESEL ENGINES (Dean Hiatt)

New off-road diesel engine requirements may significantly affect transportation project costs in the region. Staff will provide an update on the potential effects of new regulations under consideration by the California Air Resources Board that would require construction contractors to begin replacing 10 percent of their construction equipment fleet per year.

+10. STATE ROUTE 163/FRIARS ROAD INTERCHANGE PROJECT UPDATE
(Patti Boekamp, City of San Diego; Richard Chavez, SANDAG)

City of San Diego staff will provide a summary of the proposed improvements to the State Route 163/Friars Road freeway interchange project. This interchange serves major residential, commercial, and business centers within the Mission Valley community of San Diego. There is significant traffic congestion at this location during peak periods.
11. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for December 8, 2006, at 9 a.m. Please note that the December Transportation Committee meeting will be held on the second Friday of the month and will meet once due to the Christmas holiday schedule.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2006

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:02 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the October 6, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, expressed disappointment that the question about the location of a new airport as it relates to Proposition A on the November ballot is confused with our support of the Marines. He thought that various military flights could be moved to Camp Pendleton or Yuma, Arizona, without any negative impacts. He said that an affirmative vote on Proposition A is about our region’s future possibilities, not whether we support today’s Marines.

Don Stillwell, a member of the public, showed a schedule for the Green Line in 2005 that showed bus Routes 13 and 14 leaving Mission Valley stations before the trolley arrived. In 2006, he conducted similar time comparisons and found that the buses are still leaving before the trolley arrives at every stop from Fashion Valley to Amaya Drive. He suggested that those bus routes arrive at 5 minutes and 35 minutes after the hour in order for a timed connection to take place between the bus and trolley. This would provide a five-minute wait. He recommended that Transportation Committee members take the trolley and experience this misconnection to the bus anywhere on the Green Line.

Jay Powell, City Heights Community Development Corporation, wanted to place on the record this community's concern with the adoption of a Goods Movement Action Plan for Interstate 15 (I-15). He said that Caltrans and SANDAG are engaged in a project study report on that corridor to resolve conflicts between high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and bus rapid transit (BRT) operations. They have been approached and are working with the two staffs on this issue. The introduction of additional freight traffic in this already constrained corridor is not advisable. The original freeway agreement included a commitment that the state would direct truck traffic away from this project area to I-805. It explicitly identified air quality and noise impacts. Increases in freight traffic are not compatible with these
commitments and concerns. The study should include a diversion from the I-15 Mid-City corridor. He also was concerned about children’s health and the economic development of this area.

REPORTS

3. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: REGIONAL ARTERIAL SYSTEM SCREENING CRITERIA (APPROVE)

Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, reported that the Regional Arterial System (RAS) is the portion of the local street and road network that, in conjunction with the system of highways and transit services, provides for significant mobility throughout the region and accessibility between communities. The first RAS was added to the Regional Transportation Plan in 1989 and the last update occurred in 2003. The RAS is modified as needed and a Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC) was formed for this purpose. It has been meeting since January 2006 and has developed the criteria for the RAS. Ms. Werdick said that arterials must meet one of four proposed criteria; the first criterion is that the arterial is already included in the existing RAS. Any additions to the network must meet one of the remaining three criteria: provide parallel capacity in high volume corridors, provide capacity and a direct connection between regional transportation facilities, or provide for regional and/or corridor transit service. These criteria were reviewed with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (RPSWG), as well as staff from Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD).

Ms. Werdick stated that the TransNet Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) includes a new fee per dwelling unit with those funds to be used for the RAS and related transportation improvements. Eligible improvements for this funding include new or widened arterials, traffic signal coordination, freeway interchange and improvements, and express bus and rail transit improvements. The next steps are to call for modifications to the RAS, evaluate the proposed modifications, revise the RAS in early 2007, and include the updated RAS in the 2007 RTP.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if there is an appeal process if cities don’t agree with these new criteria. Ms. Werdick said that responses received from the call for modifications will be evaluated and discussed with RPSWG and CTAC.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if cities can use this funding for streetlights. Ms. Werdick didn’t think the TransNet Ordinance included streetlights as an eligible use for RAS improvement funds; however, cities can use their local TransNet money for that purpose. She offered to verify that fact.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if a date has been set when the RAS improvements will come back to the Transportation Committee for review. Ms. Werdick replied that it is scheduled to come back to this Committee in early February 2007.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, said that we have regional arterials in the general plans but sometimes they are dropped from the list and don’t get completed. He asked if there is a process for elimination from this list. Ms. Werdick stated that if there are
regional arterials that are on the list but have been dropped from city general plans, we will work with the cities on that issue.

Councilmember Lesa Heebner (NCTD) wondered if there are any travel time requirements given that road widening is part of this. Ms. Werdick replied that there are design characteristics and guidelines, but didn’t think there were specific speed requirements; however, part of the general plan circulation elements contain speed requirements.

Councilmember Heebner asked if Lomas Santa Fe going east to west is included. Ms. Werdick replied that if it was in the MOBILITY 2030 plan then it is included. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, clarified that Loma Santa Fe was not in this plan, and this is an opportunity for Solana Beach to get it into the system.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jerome Stocks (NCTD) and a second by Councilmember Bob Emery (MTS), the Transportation Committee approved the RAS screening criteria, which will be used to update the RAS network for the 2007 RTP.

4. 2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: QUARTERLY AMENDMENT NO. 1 (RECOMMEND)

Councilmember Kellejian stated that usually the approval of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendments rests with the Transportation Committee, but because this action involves TransNet funds, it will need approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Ms. Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager, reported that SANDAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for the adoption of a biennial RTIP. The RTIP is the five-year program of projects in the San Diego region that covers the period, FY 2007-2011. On August 4, 2006, the SANDAG Board approved the FY 2007-2011 RTIP, and on October 2, 2006, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a joint letter of approval. SANDAG processes amendments on a quarterly basis.

Ms. Kim stated that the Transportation Committee has the authority to approve RTIP amendments; however, this report includes a transfer of TransNet funds to a non-TransNet eligible project. In this case, the authority to approve non-TransNet projects rests with the SANDAG Board. Ms. Kim referred Committee members to the tables attached to this agenda item for specific information regarding the proposed amendments. She noted that this is a fiscally constrained document.

Councilmember Madaffer pointed out that Caltrans should be commended that the I-5 HOV/Managed Lane Auxiliary facility will be done for less money than anticipated.

Sandor Shapery (RPSWG) noted a 10 percent violation rate for HOV lane operations. He wondered if it would make any sense to put up a camera to monitor this. Mr. Gallegos responded that we have been meeting with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) on photo enforcement. The CHP has historically been opposed to that, but we continue to have discussions with them on this matter. We may have a technology piece that will help with the enforcement issue. We hope to bring back an idea that would need legislative help to
allow monies from enforcement efforts to come back to the transit agencies. He said he had an opportunity recently to participate in an ITS World Congress meeting in London, and some meeting attendees thought our violation rates were very low.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve Amendment No. 1 to the 2006 RTIP.

5. MODIFICATION TO STATE ROUTE 54 HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE FACILITY (RECOMMEND)

Chair Kellejian said this item will go to the SANDAG Board to approve the amendments proposed today.

Dean Hiatt, Senior Engineer, explained that State Route (SR) 54 is a six-lane freeway that runs east-west between Interstate 5 (I-5) and SR 125. SR 54 serves Chula Vista, National City, and a portion of the unincorporated area of the County. Currently, two of the six lanes operate as HOV lanes during peak commute periods for an approximately 2.5-mile segment between I-805 and Briarwood Road. In 1994, the SANDAG Board approved a resolution to open the State Route (SR) 54 with two general purpose lanes plus one HOV lane in each direction, rather than three general purpose lanes in each direction as originally planned. The Board’s intent was to test whether the early establishment of HOV lanes would encourage greater carpooling in the corridor and improve air quality. He introduced Lou Melendez, the Caltrans Corridor Manager for SR 54/125.

Mr. Melendez stated that data has shown operational deficiencies with this lane configuration that can be resolved. He showed aerial photos of the four segments in this corridor: I-5 to I-805, I-805 to Briarwood Road, Briarwood Road to Jamacha Boulevard (“The Gap”), and Jamacha Boulevard to SR 94, and reviewed the future proposed improvements. The deficiencies of the current HOV lanes include a mix of segments with varying lane configurations, peak-hour congestion which degrades the Level of Service, no connection to a larger HOV network, and the HOV lanes on SR 54 operate only during peak hours. Mr. Melendez noted that the standard for HOV lanes is three or more mixed-se lanes. He noted that there is a plan for HOV lanes on connecting freeways. He said that Caltrans and SANDAG are committed to implementing HOV lanes throughout the corridor. Caltrans is in the initial stages of development for a project that proposes to convert the 2.5-mile segment within SR 54 with existing HOV lanes to general purpose lanes. This work is part of the Governor’s "GO California" program. This project will use State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds with total project costs estimated at $90,000. It is scheduled to be complete in July 2007.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) noted that the South Bay cities support this modification. SR 54 is an essential east-west arterial. He was pleased to see the 2007 completion date and said that we should move forward on it.

Chair Kellejian noted that National City Vice Mayor Ron Morrison has expressed his support of this project.

Councilmember Stocks thanked staff for the report to improve conditions for motorists in this area.
Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Coastal) asked if SR 54 will eventually have HOV lanes. Mr. Hiatt replied that a decision would be made by the Board when the next set of plans is implemented. The plan is to have eight lanes; three general purpose lanes in each direction and an HOV lane in each direction. Mr. Gallegos said that our experience has been that you need at least three general purpose lanes to enable the HOV lanes to operate properly.

Councilmember Emery wanted to make sure that HOV lanes in SR 54 are not lost in the long term. Mr. Gallegos noted that Attachment 3 in the report shows the network of HOV facilities, and SR 54 is part of that network.

Mr. Orso-Delgado assured Councilmember Emery that it is in the plan and that we have sufficient right-of-way in the median for HOV lanes on this segment and on SR 125.

Councilmember Madaffer commented that it is refreshing that a government agency could admit that what was originally decided didn’t work out for the best. This change will be met with great appreciation from the motoring public.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Stocks and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the rescission of Resolution RC94-29 in order to support Caltrans’ plan to convert the HOV lanes on SR 54 from I-805 to Briarwood Road to general purpose lanes.

Chair Kellejian asked Mr. Gallegos to introduce a new face at today’s meeting. Mr. Gallegos introduced Rob Rundle, Principal Planner, as the new lead staff person for the Transportation Committee. Mr. Gallegos noted that Mr. Rundle volunteered for this position and said that he is a great addition to our team on the transportation side of the staff.

6. TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM: I-805 CORRIDOR UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Joel Haven, Caltrans I-805 corridor Project Manager, reviewed the goals for this corridor, which are to design an efficient transportation system including transit/HOV/FasTrak, provide access to high population areas, and minimize out-of-direction travel for BRT. The plan calls for two Managed Lanes northbound and southbound with a fixed barrier. He reviewed the corridor that is broken down into three segments: northern, middle, and southern. He also reviewed the proposed improvements in each segment. If Proposition 1B is approved, we may look at changes to the middle segment.

Mr. Haven said that the South Bay BRT system starts at the Otay Mesa border crossing area and extends along SR 125 to Palomar Street, to I-805, to SR 94, and into downtown San Diego. He described the station concepts for the I-805 corridor. He said that they are working with the City of Chula Vista and local developers on these stations. They have set aside a median transitway through the Otay Ranch residential villages. He showed video clips of the three segments and noted station concepts and ramp locations. He noted that we would join these BRT lanes with the ones on I-5.

Mr. Gallegos said that we are working with the City of San Diego on the Carroll Canyon project. This is a good example of partnering a local project and a freeway project to maximize cost-effectiveness.
Mr. Haven stated that $155 million that has been programmed will cover the environmental phase, right-of-way purchase, and vehicle procurement for the South Bay BRT. The entire cost for improvements in this corridor is $2.78 billion. He reviewed the schedule for this project.

Mr. Orso-Delgado pointed out that the critical part of this schedule is for the north and south segments to meet the criteria in the infrastructure bond measure. Mr. Gallegos clarified that the infrastructure bonds include projects that are ready to go by 2012, and we are working with Caltrans to make sure that happens.

Mr. Haven said that the next steps are to conduct value engineering, evaluate alternatives, develop a freeway shoulder operating plan, evaluate New Starts funding, and release the draft environmental document.

Mr. Emery recognized that this is a work in progress and that staffs are working together. He wanted staff to consider the following impacts on transit operations in the corridor: (1) the possible relocation of the 47th Street Trolley Station, (2) HOV-to-HOV interchanges that are not part of the TransNet Ordinance but are an integral part of this system, and (3) the fact that there is no operating plan for BRT.

Councilmember Rindone concurred with Councilmember Emery’s concept. In 2009, when construction begins in Chula Vista, there will be a lot of controversy due to the removal of the landscape median. However, it was disclosed in all real estate transactions that this area was planned for transit. The intent was to have 90 percent of the residents living within a quarter-mile walking distance of the transit line.

Chair Kellejian noted that there are signs in the right-of-way indicating that it is a future transitway. Mr. Gallegos stated that from staff’s point of view, we are counting on the City of Chula Vista and the City Council to help with concerns in that area.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) would like a report on connectivity between the BRT systems on both I-805 and I-15. In addition, Councilmember Atkins would like to better understand how HOV, Managed Lanes, and goods movement between improvements will all fit in the I-15 and I-805 corridors.

Harry Mathis, Chairman of MTS, said that while some projects are not specifically called out in the TransNet Ordinance, they are integral to the functionality of projects in TransNet.

Councilmember Monroe said he is confused about planning versus operations for these projects. Mr. Gallegos said that it is a partnership among SANDAG, Caltrans, and the transit operators. We look at the regional need and try to work closely with both operators for the operations plan. We are learning from the I-15 project.

Mr. Orso-Delgado added that we are trying to enable SANDAG to implement an early action project by utilizing the freeway shoulders.

Mr. Haven stated that MTS is part of the project development team, and no decision will be made without its participation.
Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for November 3, 2006, at 9 a.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:08 a.m.
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CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED
PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE

Introduction

Since 1993, the State of California has authorized the study of an intercity, high-speed passenger rail system that will connect the state’s metropolitan areas including San Diego (Attachment 1). The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is the statewide agency charged with the planning and construction of this system.

To address the planning activities related to the proposed high-speed rail system and how they relate to San Diego, SANDAG established the Regional High-Speed Rail Task Force in 1999. Members included representatives from the Transportation Committee, North County Transit District, Metropolitan Transit System, the Centre City Development Corporation, Department of Defense, and elected officials from the coastal and Interstate 15 (I-15) communities. In May 2005, with the concurrence of the Task Force, the SANDAG Executive Committee approved the transfer of responsibility for monitoring these efforts to the Transportation Committee through quarterly updates, provided that Task Force members be notified of these quarterly updates, that high-speed rail be incorporated into the update of the Regional Transportation Plan, and that SANDAG keep open the possibility of reactivating the Task Force should activity warrant it.

Discussion of Progress this Quarter

Regional Environmental/Engineering Work

The approved FY 2007 state budget includes $14.3 million for the Authority to begin project implementation. As a result, the Authority has released Requests for Qualifications (RFQs) for qualified firms to begin preliminary engineering and environmental work on six segments of the high-speed train network, including the Los Angeles to San Diego (via Inland Empire) segment. Authority staff expects to have a consultant under contract in early 2007 to begin this next phase of I-15 corridor work. Specific tasks will include preliminary engineering and environmental impact analysis of the high-speed train (HST) route and facilities, and project-level, site-specific environmental documents.

Feasibility Study of I-15 Commuter Rail Service

SANDAG staff is participating in a feasibility study of commuter rail options along the I-15 Corridor from Riverside County to downtown San Diego at the request of the project sponsor, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC). The study will focus on using the alignment developed by the Authority for either (1) Metrolink-type commuter rail service or (2) high-speed commuter rail
service sharing the track with the intercity HST service. RCTC began this study in early September 2006 and has formed a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), including SANDAG, corridor cities, and transit agencies, to comment on this study.

The first TAC meeting was held October 18, 2006, in Temecula. In attendance were SANDAG, MTS, and City of Escondido staffs. The meeting focused on the scope of work for the study, which includes the two alternatives discussed above. Both alternatives build upon the HST alignment from southwest Riverside County, via the I-15 corridor, cutting across the region at either Miramar Road or Carroll Canyon Road to University City, and sharing the corridor with Coaster, Amtrak, and freight to downtown San Diego. RCTC recommends evaluating a commuter rail station in the Rancho Bernardo/Poway/State Route 56 area, in addition to the HST stations shown in Attachment 1. Both alternatives will be evaluated using eight criteria including ridership, mobility improvements, access to low-income households, operating costs, total capital costs, capital cost per passenger, farebox recovery, and institutional issues. RCTC expects to hold one additional TAC meeting in January 2007 and expects the study to conclude in March 2007.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. California High-Speed Train System Project Background
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CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN SYSTEM

Project Background

Since 1993, the State of California has authorized the study of an intercity, high-speed passenger rail system. The California High-Speed Rail Commission studied this system until the agency “sunsetted” in 1996. The state then created a new agency, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority), and gave it responsibility for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California's major metropolitan areas, including San Diego. The Governor and Legislature have granted the Authority all the powers necessary to oversee the construction and operation of a statewide system once financing is secured. The Authority has a nine-member policy board and a small staff. In 2000, the Authority adopted a Final Business Plan for an economically viable train system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour on a fully grade-separated track with state-of-the-art safety, signaling, and automated control systems.

The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento (Figure 1). San Diego would be connected from Los Angeles via the Inland Empire. High-speed train (HST) service along the Inland Corridor would parallel Interstates 215 and 15 and extend south to downtown San Diego. HST service on the coastal corridor would extend no further south than Irvine, as a result of environmental constraints along the coast and in coastal communities between South Orange County and San Diego. Between Los Angeles and Irvine, HST service would share the corridor with existing Amtrak intercity service, Metrolink commuter rail service, and freight.

The Safe, Reliable High-Speed Train Bond Act for the 21st Century is scheduled for the November 2008 ballot. This Act includes $9 billion for planning and construction of a high-speed train (HST) system statewide. An additional $950 million is included in the Act for improvements to feeder rail systems including San Diego’s coastal rail corridor and other rail lines.
Figure 1.
Proposed California High-Speed Train Statewide System
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Introduction

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

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

LOSSAN Board Action Highlights Related to SANDAG Actions

The LOSSAN Board continues to advocate for passenger rail funds that would benefit projects along the coastal rail corridor, including projects along the San Diego coastal rail corridor. The Board approved Resolutions of Support for Propositions 1A and 1B, consistent with the SANDAG Board of Directors. LOSSAN continued its support for a federal/state rail capital program that provides credit to states for past investments in rail. These actions also will benefit the San Diego coastal rail corridor.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBERS

Chair: Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Vice Chair: Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit District

Richard Dixon
Orange County Transportation Authority

Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

Keith Millhouse
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Susan Rose
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

John Shoals
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Bill Bronte
Caltrans, Division of Rail

ALTERNATES

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Salud Carbajal
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Mary Ann Reiss
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Jerome Stocks
North County Transit District

Ex Officio Member

Lou Bone
Southern California Association of Governments

Additional Technical Advisory Committee Members

Amtrak
Burlington Northern Santa Fe
California Public Utilities Commission
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
Union Pacific
Board Actions: September 2006

LOSSAN CORRIDOR LEGISLATIVE AND FUNDING ISSUES

The Board approved Resolutions of Support for Proposition 1A and 1B, which respectively will protect Proposition 42 funds and provide $19 billion for transportation infrastructure. This support will be transmitted to the Governor and state corridor delegation.

The Board reiterated its support for a federal/state rail capital program and directed staff to contact Representative Bill Thomas (R-Bakersfield), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee for his leadership on this matter.

The Board discussed details of the upcoming statewide rail board meeting to discuss common issues between LOSSAN, the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, the San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee, and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council. Topics include the statewide infrastructure bond measures, protection of state intercity rail funds, federal/state rail capital program, and coordination with host railroads. The meeting is planned for mid-October in San Jose.

LOSSAN CORRIDORWIDE STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN STATUS REPORT

The LOSSAN Corridorwide Strategic Business Plan establishes a plan of improvements for the corridor. Work to date has been focused on the northern corridor between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo that will be integrated with similar work completed for the Los Angeles to San Diego segment in 2004. Proposed commuter rail between Ventura and Santa Barbara also will be analyzed. A major component of the study is to model the existing and future rail service levels and needed network infrastructure in 2006, 2015, and 2025. The Board discussed the first rail capacity modeling analysis completed for the 2006 base case and provided several comments.

For the base case, an average of 52 passenger trains (Amtrak and Metrolink) and 10 freight trains use the northern corridor each weekday. Overall, the analysis reviewed key chokepoints along the northern corridor including station platforms, sids, or double tracking improvements at Van Nuys, Oxnard, Control Point (CP) Raymer to CP De Soto, and between Santa Barbara and Ventura.

Detailed capacity modeling for 2015 and 2025, and the proposed commuter rail service, will be presented at the Board’s December meeting.

ACTION REGARDING THE COAST STARLIGHT

For several months, the monthly on-time performance of Amtrak’s Coast Starlight service between Los Angeles and Seattle has been zero percent. The Board has discussed the situation at several past meetings and directed staff to contact Union Pacific, which owns 83 percent of the rail corridor on which the Starlight operates, to request action be taken to help these performance issues.
SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED COAST DAYLIGHT TRAIN

The Board of Directors formalized its support for the proposed Coast Daylight Train service between San Francisco and Los Angeles. The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) is requesting that corridor agencies and jurisdictions pass Resolutions of Support for an FY 2007 state budget allocation to fund this service as proposed in the 10-year statewide rail plan.

LOSSAN CORRIDOR CONDITIONS

Amtrak provided detailed revenue and ridership figures for the Pacific Surfliner service, including the announcement of another month of record ridership. On-time performance continued to decline and was 65 percent for August 2006.

The Board discussed the issues surrounding on-time performance and interaction with other train services in the corridor and voted to create a Task Force of Board and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members to address the specifics of this issue. Staff will request Board representatives to participate in the next TAC meeting and prepare a report for the Board’s next meeting in December.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The next Board of Directors meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 2006, in Los Angeles at 11:30 a.m. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 7, 2006, in Los Angeles at 11:30 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Board received a letter from RailPAC regarding the need for action to improve the corridor and for recognition among the corridor delegation to this situation.
Introduction

Within the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), SANDAG utilizes performance measures to examine how different land use and transportation network scenarios meet regional measures of performance. This report addresses the revised performance measures recommended for use in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The performance measures correspond to the Plan’s seven policy goals set by the Board of Directors: Livability, Mobility, Accessibility, Reliability, Efficiency, Sustainability, and Equity. The measures are utilized to compare future regional transportation networks and land use scenarios against current conditions, a “no build” scenario, and each other.

The last RTP performance measure update took place during the preparation of MOBILITY 2030, which was adopted by SANDAG in 2003. In preparation for the 2007 RTP, the existing performance measures were revised with the assistance of an ad hoc working group appointed by the Transportation Committee.

Discussion

The performance measures were updated for use in the 2007 RTP by the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC), which was formed by the Transportation Committee at its December 9, 2005, meeting. The TPEC is composed of representatives from a number of standing SANDAG working groups, including the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional Freight Working Group, Regional Housing Working Group, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, as well as staff from Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District. The TPEC has met regularly since January 2006, and has recommended modifications to the performance measures as discussed below.

Recommended Modifications

Utilizing the performance measures from MOBILITY 2030 (Attachment 1) as a base, the TPEC has proposed a number of modifications (Attachment 2). In order to create a more accurate portrayal of conditions in the region, the TPEC has recommended that a number of performance measures be modified from absolute to per capita measures. These modifications will demonstrate changes in the performance of the transportation network while accounting for the projected increase in regional population by the year 2030.
Additionally the TPEC has recommended the addition of three new performance measures.

- Daily hours of delay on the regional freight network (as defined in the 2007 RTP), which serves as a goods movement performance measure.

- The percentage of daily trips within ¼ mile of a transit stop, which monitors all of the daily trip destinations within walking distance to a transit stop.

- Average trip distance, which provides for a measurement of the relationship between land use and transportation performance.

The TPEC has also recommended two additional modifications to the MOBILITY 2030 criteria.

- The percentage of homes within a ½ mile of a transit stop measure will be moved from the Livability category to Equity, which will allow for this measure to be displayed by income and ethnic categories.

- The MOBILITY 2030 measure percentage of jobs within ¼ mile of a transit stop is revised to the percentage of peak period trips within ¼ mile of a transit stop. This modification is consistent with the 2007 RTP criteria adopted by the SANDAG Board on October 13, 2006, and allows for a more comprehensive inclusion of all peak period trips regardless of type.

The full set of recommended Draft 2007 RTP Performance Measures is featured in Attachment 3.

**Next Steps**

If approved by the Transportation Committee, the revised performance measures will be used to evaluate the performance of various transportation network scenarios in the 2007 RTP.

---

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. MOBILITY 2030 Comparison of Performance Measures  
  2. Proposed Changes to the MOBILITY 2030 Performance Measures for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan  
  3. Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Performance Measures
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## MOBILITY 2030 COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT (2000)</th>
<th>&quot;NO BUILD&quot; (2030)</th>
<th>MOBILITY 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average work trip travel time</td>
<td>24 min.</td>
<td>28 min.</td>
<td>25 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily travel time</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>16 min.</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average work trip travel speed by mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
<td>22 mph</td>
<td>28 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>31 mph</td>
<td>23 mph</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>10 mph</td>
<td>10 mph</td>
<td>14 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ACCESSIBILITY** | | | |
| Work/school trips within 30 minutes | 71% | 60% | 67% |
| Non-work trips within 15 minutes | 69% | 65% | 66% |

| **RELIABILITY** | | | |
| Daily accidents/fatalities | 88 | 129 | 130 |
| Congested peak period travel conditions | 29% | 45% | 25% |
| Congested daily travel conditions | 20% | 38% | 17% |

| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
| Out-of-pocket user costs | $1.70/trip | $1.62/trip | $1.75/trip |
| Total 30-year public and private travel costs | $1.80/trip | $1.66/trip | $1.88/trip |

| **LIVABILITY** | | | |
| Homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop | 63% | 58% | 63% |
| Jobs within 1/4 mile of a transit stop | 39% | 36% | 45% |
| Work trip mode split | | | |
| Drive alone | 78% | 79% | 74% |
| Carpool | 12% | 12% | 12% |
| Transit | 5% | 4% | 10% |
| Bike/Walk/Other | 5% | 5% | 4% |

| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
| Smog-forming pollutants | 241 tons | 44 tons | 43 tons |
| On-road fuel consumption (gallons) | 3.9 million | 5.8 million | 5.9 million |
| Daily vehicle miles traveled | 74.7 million | 109.7 million | 112.2 million |
| Daily transit passenger miles | 1.7 million | 2.0 million | 5.2 million |
| Constrained lands consumed for new transportation infrastructure | N/A | N/A | 138 acres |

| **EQUITY** | | | |
| Comparison of low income vs. non-low income and minority vs. non-minority: | | | |
| Average Travel Time (minutes) | | | |
| Low income vs. non-low income | N/A | 16 vs. 16 minutes | 16 vs. 15 minutes |
| Minority vs. non-minority | N/A | 15 vs. 16 minutes | 15 vs. 15 minutes |
| Work/school trips within 30 minutes | | | |
| Low income vs. non-low income | N/A | 64% vs. 59% | 68% vs. 67% |
| Minority vs. non-minority | N/A | 61% vs. 59% | 69% vs. 66% |
| Non-work trips within 15 minutes | | | |
| Low income vs. non-low income | N/A | 61% vs. 66% | 60% vs. 66% |
| Minority vs. non-minority | N/A | 67% vs. 64% | 67% vs. 65% |

SOURCE: SANDAG
## Proposed Changes to MOBILITY 2030 Performance Measures for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTP Goal</th>
<th>MOBILITY 2030 Performance Measure</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Reason For Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Daily vehicular crashes</td>
<td>Daily vehicular crash rate per capita</td>
<td>The per capita modification allows for a more accurate comparison of vehicular crashes in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability</td>
<td>Percentage of jobs within 1/4 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td>Percentage of peak period trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td>The proposed measure is consistent with the revised project evaluation criteria and accounts for all trips within a 1/4 mile of a transit stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Smog-forming pollutants</td>
<td>Smog-forming pollutants per capita</td>
<td>The per capita modification allows for a more accurate comparison of smog-forming pollutants in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-road fuel consumption (gallons)</td>
<td>On-road fuel consumption (gallons) per capita</td>
<td>The per capita modification allows for a more accurate comparison of fuel consumed in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>Daily vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>The per capita modification allows for a more accurate comparison of vehicle miles traveled in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily transit passenger miles</td>
<td>Daily transit passenger miles per capita</td>
<td>The per capita modification allows for a more accurate comparison of transit passenger miles traveled in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Percentage of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop</td>
<td>Previously under &quot;Livability&quot;</td>
<td>This measure will now be displayed by income and ethnic categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan
### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTP Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mobility** | Average work trip travel time  
Average daily travel time  
Average work trip travel speed by mode |
| **Accessibility** | Percentage of work/school trips within 30 minutes by mode  
Percentage of non-work trips within 15 minutes by mode |
| **Reliability** | Daily vehicular crash rate per capita  
Congested peak period travel conditions (percentage)  
Congested daily travel conditions (percentage)  
Daily hours of delay (per 1000 vehicle miles traveled) on the regional freight network |
| **Efficiency** | Out-of-pocket user costs (per trip)  
Total 30-year public and private travel costs (per trip) |
| **Livability** | Percentage of daily trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop  
Work trip mode split  
Percentage of daily trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop  
Average trip distance |
| **Sustainability** | Smog-forming pollutants per capita  
On-road fuel consumption (gallons) per capita  
Daily vehicle miles traveled per capita  
Daily transit passenger miles per capita  
Constrained lands consumed for new transportation infrastructure |
| **Equity**   | Average travel time (minutes)  
Percentage of work/school trips within 30 minutes  
Percentage of non-work trips within 15 minutes  
Percentage of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop |
FY 2007 TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT

Introduction

SANDAG policy requires Transportation Committee approval for budget transfers in amounts between $100,000 and $500,000 cumulative. The proposed action would transfer $200,216 from the closed Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) capital projects indicated in Attachment 1 to cover the funding shortfall in the MTS FY 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

This amendment to the MTS FY 2007 CIP was approved by the MTS Board of Directors at its October 19, 2006, meeting.

Discussion

Prior to finalizing the FY 2007 MTS CIP, all previously budgeted capital projects were reviewed to identify certain projects that may have been delayed or completed under budget. This was done to ensure that deserving new projects do not go unfunded while prior year capital programming remained encumbered and unused. As a result of this review, $2.5 million was identified to be transferred to the FY 2007 CIP. At its February 24, 2006, meeting the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the FY 2007 CIP which included the transfer of $2,452,100 from existing capital projects to the MTS FY 2007 CIP.

Upon approval of the FY 2007 CIP, staff began the transfer process to move the approved transfers from individual capital projects to the MTS FY 2007 CIP. After all FY 2006 project expenditures were finalized, $200,216 in funding for the approved transfers was not available as anticipated. SANDAG and MTS staffs have subsequently identified additional closed projects with available funds to cover the funding shortfall. Attachment 1 identifies the individual projects, the original transfers as approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 24, 2006, and the revised amounts staff is recommending transferring from each capital project.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. SANDAG/MTS Capital Improvement Program - Project Transfers FY 2007

Key Staff Contact: Kimberly York, (619) 699-6902, kyo@sandag.org
**SANDAG/MTS**  
**Capital Improvement Program - Project Transfers**  
**FY 2007**  
*(in 000's)*

## TRANSFERS APPROVED BY THE SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
**ON FEBRUARY 24, 2006, AND REVISED TRANSFERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Approved Transfer ('000's)</th>
<th>Revised Transfer ('000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1044300</td>
<td>IAD CNG Facility Improvements</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045200</td>
<td>Curve Straightening</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057900</td>
<td>IAD/KMD Clean Up Study</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069600</td>
<td>LRT Station Surveillance. Systems</td>
<td>284.4</td>
<td>254.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073900</td>
<td>KMD Oil Tank Installation</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083400</td>
<td>Broadway Wye Signal Modifications</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084200</td>
<td>Fenton Parkway Station</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084300</td>
<td>Fenton Parkway Grade Crossing</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086200</td>
<td>Computer Upgrades (Risk)</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088800</td>
<td>Grade Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089300</td>
<td>Sweetwater Flats Switch Replacement</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090700</td>
<td>Bus Surveillance Cameras</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094800</td>
<td>LRT Station Svc Panel Upgrade</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095100</td>
<td>Rail Replacement - 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097400</td>
<td>Replace Switches - State / Columbia</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097500</td>
<td>F Street Diamond Replacement</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098600</td>
<td>SDTC Engine Retrofits</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>141.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098700</td>
<td>50 Rebuild Transmissions</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099300</td>
<td>IAD Expansion Land Purchase</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102200</td>
<td>IAD Building Shakeup Room</td>
<td>144.6</td>
<td>139.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102800</td>
<td>LRV HVAC Modification Phase II</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>112.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108700</td>
<td>SD100 Digital Voice System Replacement</td>
<td>583.5</td>
<td>583.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112600</td>
<td>LRV Tires</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113000</td>
<td>SDTC Supervisor Vehicles</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113100</td>
<td>MTS 9th Floor Copy Machine</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Transfers to cover CIP Shortfall**  
$2,452.1

## CLOSED PROJECTS WITH AVAILABLE BUDGET TO COVER MTS FY 2007 CIP SHORTFALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount ('000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1074500</td>
<td>SBMF Building Repairs</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083300</td>
<td>SDTI Revenue Facility Addition</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087900</td>
<td>Blue Line Switch Machine</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088600</td>
<td>SDTI Pit Light Replacement</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089000</td>
<td>SDTI Brake Overhaul Clean Room</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094100</td>
<td>MTDB Vehicles</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095800</td>
<td>KMD Underground Tanks</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104000</td>
<td>SDTC Transmission Overhauls</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108200</td>
<td>IAD Steam Cleaner</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112600</td>
<td>LRV Tires</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113000</td>
<td>SDTC Supervisor Vehicles</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113100</td>
<td>MTS 9th Floor Copy Machine</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Transfers to cover CIP Shortfall**  
$200.2

**Total Transfers to FY 07 CIP**  
$2,452.1
Introduction

The North County Transit District (NCTD) SPRINTER Rail Project converts an existing 22-mile freight rail corridor into a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) transit system connecting Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido. The SPRINTER is one of the regional transportation projects in the original TransNet measure. In response to requests from NCTD and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), SANDAG staff is currently providing support and oversight of the project, and has been asked by the SANDAG Board of Directors to report on its progress monthly to the Transportation Committee.

Background

In summer 2006, NCTD began developing additional controls on its budget and schedule to address increases in the SPRINTER project budget and other FTA concerns. Controls to better forecast the schedule are now in place and are proving to be effective tools to predict overall project completion. These controls have only been in place for a short time and continue to be refined, but it appears that an overall completion date of early 2008 is achievable assuming there are no significant weather delays this winter.

Controls to forecast the final cost of the project are still being developed and should be in place within a month. The NCTD Amended Recovery Plan, developed last August, identified risks to the NCTD final project budget. The FTA mandated the pricing of certain risks, which caused an increase in the estimated project cost to $484.1 million. None of the risks identified in the plan, however, have so far come to fruition, while other risks have been partially mitigated. Therefore, at this time, the forecast in August appears to be conservative. As the controls are developed this month, a more complete assessment of final cost can be made.

Finally, to improve overall management of the project, NCTD has supplemented its construction management team with specialty staff dedicated to project controls and office engineering assistance to avoid any owner-caused delays.

Discussion

Current Progress

The SPRINTER project continues to make steady progress on multiple fronts. On the Mainline Contract, over 18 of the 32 miles of new track have been reconstructed, and 32 of 36 grade crossings have been rebuilt. On the California State University San Marcos Loop contract, all five of
the new bridges have been substantially completed, as has the new Barham Lane and work in the Civic Center area. At the vehicle maintenance facility in Escondido, installation of plumbing and other systems continues, and storage track capacity has been completed that is sufficient to store 10 of the 12 rail cars. On the DMU contract, 10 of the cars are now complete and stored on the property.

Overall, these four contracts are 66.4 percent complete as of the end of September 2006, based on billings to date. When comparing billings against time expended, construction is on schedule. Cumulatively, for all four contracts, approved change orders stand at 4.8 percent of work completed and billed to date (Attachment 1).

**SANDAG Oversight**

At the direction of the FTA, NCTD developed an Amended Recovery Plan during the summer of 2006 to address budget and schedule challenges on the project. As part of this plan, NCTD requested assistance from SANDAG staff in the areas of project controls and start-up. In addition, at its September meeting, the Board of Directors directed staff to oversee progress of the project, provide an independent assessment of the project budget and schedule, and report back to the Transportation Committee each month.

The scope of the SANDAG involvement includes oversight of the project schedule, cost, and quality control. We are tracking progress and issues involving the purchase of the 12 new DMU rail cars. We also are monitoring the effectiveness of the project team including the team organization, their technical strengths, their relationships, and the communication among team members. All the above factors will bear on the successful delivery of this project.

**Schedule**

NCTD has sufficient controls in place to monitor the progress of each contractor and supplier on the project. NCTD not only uses traditional critical path scheduling methods, but also more advanced efficiency, manpower, and trend analyses. Two of the three construction contracts have more than enough float time available, and it is anticipated that they will not impact the overall project completion. Delivery and commissioning of the DMU rail cars is in a similar situation. Only construction work on the Mainline contract has the potential to delay overall completion.

Recently, NCTD developed a “start-up” plan that schedules all necessary tasks to be performed after contractor turnover but before the start of revenue service. Start-up activities include testing the vehicles and systems, emergency drills, and simulated operations. The schedule component of this plan is currently being integrated with the various construction/procurement schedules for a single master project schedule. This master schedule will be used to monitor the impact of any change on the earliest start of revenue service, also called the revenue operations date (ROD). The current master schedule has a ROD in January 2008. NCTD will prepare a schedule with a target ROD of December 2007 in order to see what actions would be needed to accelerate the schedule. NCTD will need to declare an ROD in mid-2007 to allow time for systemwide operational changes such as changing bus routes to feed the SPRINTER.
**Cost**

NCTD has sufficient controls in place to track expenditures on each construction contract including the cost of future change orders. Unfortunately, NCTD could not bring on its new cost engineer as soon as anticipated, and therefore, other controls are still under development. These other controls include tracking not only construction costs but also vehicle, construction management, design support, insurance, in-house staff, environmental mitigation, and start-up costs. These controls are being developed and are expected to be in place within a month. The result of all the above will be a “living” cost to complete that will predict total project expenditures on a monthly basis and the ability to track how changes impact final cost. This cost to complete will not be a blank check, but an effort to continually compare the anticipated final cost to the approved budget.

The Amended Recovery Plan identifies the top ten risks to the project budget. Additional construction management and design costs, future change orders on the Mainline contract, and regulatory requirements, are some of the major risks identified. Each risk has a series of actions identified to potentially mitigate the additional cost. NCTD produces a monthly report that tracks the risks and mitigations. To date, none of the risks identified have come to fruition, and many of the risks have been partially mitigated resulting in an estimated $14 million potential savings to the “at risk” contingency. Risks that are still of particular concern include the cost impact of construction quantity overruns compared to the engineer’s estimate, the design and integration of communication and railroad signaling, and the cost to provide design support through construction. Design support has been especially frustrating to the team as the designer is still developing controls to ensure the redesigns are on time, within negotiated budget, and of acceptable quality.

**Quality**

NCTD has an extensive construction management team that provides oversight of all contractor activities. NCTD also monitors the quality of the work installed or procured via “nonconformance reports” that track work not meeting specifications. Each contractor has developed quality control plans, and NCTD employs a quality manager independent of the construction management team to oversee this effort. These controls have worked well on this project and quality does not seem to be an issue. The quality of the work on the new DMU vehicles will be determined when testing begins in late November.

**Organizational Effectiveness**

The construction manager’s role has been expanded to include cost and schedule management for the entire project. NCTD also has added a project controls director, a start-up manager, a regulatory start-up coordinator, a cost engineer, a project accountant, a stormwater inspector, and an office engineer to its team. NCTD is interviewing candidates for three other engineering positions that are open. These positions are being filled by not only NCTD staff and consultants but also by SANDAG, SANDAG consultants, and City of San Diego staff on a reimbursed basis.

Overall, both the new and existing members of the SPRINTER team are very seasoned professionals. We believe NCTD now has the technical capacity in both quantity and quality of staff to manage a project of this size and complexity.
NCTD has regular meetings on construction progress, safety, start-up, internal milestones, and other key project deliverables in order to ensure issues are being communicated and problems solved. Monthly reports are written to track the recovery plan efforts, the contractor’s performance, and the overall project.

The leadership from NCTD, the construction manager, and the Mainline/Loop contractor meet on a weekly basis to discuss problems and disputes. Their relationship is very good and should lead to the early resolution to any potential claims.

**Project Concerns**

Projects this size have many problems that are solved on a daily basis. Problems that are not resolved timely are of particular concern because of the potential to delay work and increase cost. The following are examples we are tracking.

1. The subcontractor that is installing the railroad signaling and communication systems may be understaffed. Shifting some of the work to another electrical contractor on the project is being discussed.

2. Railroad signals preempt city traffic signals at grade crossings. NCTD has hired two specialized consultants to assist the city traffic engineers in modifying their traffic controllers near SPRINTER grade crossings.

3. The project designer needs to improve the quality and timeliness of his work. He also needs to better control costs of each redesign effort.

4. There have been more than 400 construction change orders issued, many related to quantity and/or design problems whose time adjustments could impact the completion schedule.

**Next Steps**

Over the next six weeks, the controls will be put in place to monitor total project cost and other metrics that will allow the Transportation Committee to monitor the overall status of the project. The master project schedule, with a target ROD of December 2007, will be available and the impacts to achieve this will be identified. We also will start identifying potential regulatory concerns from third parties like the Federal Railroad Administration and the California Public Utilities Commission.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation


Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
## SPRINTER RAIL PROJECT
**MONTHLY STATUS REPORT**
**September 2006**

### Description
The SPRINTER Rail Project is converting an existing 22-mile freight rail corridor into a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU), single-track line transit system running east from Oceanside, through Vista, San Marcos, and unincorporated portions of San Diego County, to Escondido. The alignment also includes 1.7 miles of new right-of-way to serve the campus of California State University San Marcos. The project alignment will include three new 3.5-mile passing tracks, 15 stations; and procurement of 12 DMU vehicles. A new Vehicle Maintenance Facility is being built in Escondido.

### Current Status:

**Mainline Contract**
Mainline Contract Value: $182.4 million net of insurance
- 18 miles of ballasted track, out of 32 miles total, has been reconstructed.
- 32 of 36 grade crossings have been reconstructed
- Station platform construction is underway at multiple stations.
- Contract is 59.3% complete.
- Net Change orders as percent of construction value to date: 5.1%

**CSUSM Loop Contract**
CSUSM Loop Contract Value: $23.5 million net of insurance
- Construction on all five concrete bridges substantially complete.
- San Marcos Civic Ctr paving, parking reconfiguration 90% complete.
- Contract is 77.0% complete, finish is expected in late November 2006.
- Net Change orders as percent of construction value to date: 4.5%

**Vehicle Maintenance Facility Contract (VMF)**
Vehicle Maintenance Facility Contract Value: $23.6 million net of insurance
- Plumbing and HVAC systems installation continues.
- Storage tracks completed sufficient to store 8 DMUs.
- Contract is 78.3% complete, early substantial completion expected in December 2006.
- Net Change orders as percent of construction value to date: 2.5%

**DMU Contract**
DMU Contract Value: $50.6 million.
- Eight (8) of the twelve DMUs are completed and on-site at the VMF.
- DMU static testing continues for delivered units.
- Contract is 81.5% complete, completion expected in November 2006.
- Net Change orders as percent of manufacture value to date: 5.3%

### Cost
The current NCTD-adopted budget is $440 million. NCTD provided an updated cost-to-complete estimate to the FTA in May 2006. The Project Management Oversight Consultant (PMOC) and the FTA evaluated NCTD’s cost-to-complete estimate and identified additional potential cost risks. NCTD has submitted the final *Amended Recovery Plan* which accounts for these additional risks, with the FFFG-project budget estimated at up to $460.3 million, and the total project, including locally-funded project components, up to $484.1 million. We anticipate FTA approval of the *Amended Recovery Plan* shortly.
| **Funding** | In recognition of NCTD’s efforts in submitting the *Amended Recovery Plan*, on September 21, FTA released $5.6 million of the $66.7 million in FY05 and FY06 Full-Funding Grant Agreement funds being held. FTA plans to release an additional $14.4 million on October 18 to meet NCTD’s cash flow needs on the project. These FTA funds releases will postpone NCTD’s need to make use of SANDAG’s commercial paper program. |
| **Ongoing Cost Control Measures** | NCTD has employed a number of project and cost control measures from the beginning of construction. These include:  
  - Co-location of NCTD, CM, and designer at field site office;  
  - Ongoing formal Partnering Sessions and weekly senior management meetings with Contractor;  
  - Staff up field engineering in field office;  
  - Use VCEP clauses of contracts where feasible to reduce costs;  
  - Assign separate Construction Management firm Contract Manager and NCTD Project Officer for each contract;  
  - Use Change Order Review Board for large C/O’s.  
  - All proposed changes to include a change order evaluation and negotiation of cost and profit rate. |
| **Cost Control Measures - Additional** | As part of the *Amended Recovery Plan*, NCTD identified the top cost risks to the project and provided a “Risk Mitigation and Management Plan” to address these risks and reduce their likely impact. Progress on those Plan elements include:  
  - Program-level start-up, cost engineering, office engineering, and project accounting staff positions have been filled to improve schedule and cost forecasting and construction management. SANDAG is providing a Project Controls oversight role.  
  - A draft integrated schedule based on all known project activities and durations leading to start-up has been developed, which is more comprehensive than stand-alone construction schedules.  
  - The Construction Management scheduling team is providing updated schedule forecast reports using Critical Path Method, earned-value analysis, manpower analysis, and payment application analysis as project control techniques.  
  - Detailed sub-schedules for all critical activities on train control/signaling and communications systems have been developed and are being used by the CM team to closely track and manage progress in those key areas.  
  - A monthly Risk Mitigation and Management Plan reporting system has been established with milestones for ongoing assessment of risks and accomplishment vs. schedules for the overall project.  
  - Monthly resource level reporting against budget by the design consultant has been established to control costs in that area. Further controls are being implemented.  
  - Risks are being reevaluated at key milestone achievements. |
| **Schedule Assessment:** | **Mainline Contract** – Schedule still viable to meet December 2007 date. The longest critical path is currently the Communications Equipment cabinets for the stations.  
**Loop Contract** – Schedule anticipates a late November 2006 completion.  
**DMUs** – On schedule, with 8 cars delivered in August and September 2006. |
| **Anticipated Activity Next Month:** | • Continued grade crossing work in Oceanside and County unincorporated areas.  
• Continued delivery of DMUs.  
• Continued systems installation at the Vehicle Maintenance Facility.  
• Begin vehicle and system testing on test track.  
• Fill remaining office engineer and project officer positions.  
• Provide ongoing monthly reporting on project controls to FTA. |
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 3, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM  File Number 1110200

Introduction

At prior meetings, the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors have received briefings on the status of the SPRINT project. These briefings have included a review of the construction status of the project, the current situation related to the budget for the project, and the project management controls that have been developed to contain the costs on the project.

These briefings also have included a review of the interim financial strategy regarding the use of the SANDAG commercial paper program to cover any shortfalls in the monthly cash flow needs of the project over the few months until there is greater certainty regarding the availability of funding to be provided through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the results of the November election, and the total cost of the project. This item reflects the next step in the process of developing a financial plan for the SPRINT. One of the key components of this plan involves the potential of amending the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan to include the completion of the SPRINT project, which would add this project to the TransNet Early Action Program. In addition, the Transportation Committee should provide any comments on the proposed revisions to the EAP to add funding for the Environmental Mitigation Program and capital improvements to the Trolley.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to discuss the SPRINT financial plan options and provide comments or direction to staff regarding the proposed concept of amending the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan to include the completion of the SPRINT project, which would add this project to the TransNet Early Action Program. In addition, the Transportation Committee should provide any comments on the proposed revisions to the EAP to add funding for the Environmental Mitigation Program and capital improvements to the Trolley.

In addition, staff is proposing to evaluate the financial feasibility of implementing two other revisions to the EAP including near-term capital improvements to the San Diego Trolley and additional EAP funding for the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The EAP funding of the Trolley capital improvements would provide match for funding that would be available to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) through the state infrastructure bond (Proposition 1B) and would be subject to passage of the measure. Increased funding for the EMP would accelerate the mitigation of future corridors in order to help the region compete better for discretionary major corridor bond funding.
Discussion

SPRINTER Financial Plan Options

As discussed at prior Transportation Committee and Board of Directors meetings, the SPRINTER cost increase may be as much as $98.6 million. While North County Transit District (NCTD) has taken several steps to mitigate the potential cost risks, it is best to plan for the worst-case scenario. In that endeavor, SANDAG staff has developed two new proposed funding plans to fully fund the SPRINTER project. Proposed Plan A has been developed in the event that the pending infrastructure bond measure (Proposition 1B) meets with voter approval and provides new formula-based revenues to NCTD that could be applied to the SPRINTER overrun. Proposed Plan B provides an option in the event that the infrastructure bond measure does not pass. Both plans rely on the use of revenues from the TransNet Extension and would require an amendment to the 2004 TransNet Ordinance.

Figure 1 below details the funding sources that make up the more optimistic Proposed SPRINTER Funding Plan A. This plan uses $50 million out of the $53.7 million in infrastructure bond funds (Prop. 1B - State Transit Assistance [STA] Funds) estimated to accrue to NCTD. The $3.7 million in uncommitted funds may be needed for potential financing costs if, as is likely, the monies are not available in an immediate one-time allocation.

**FIGURE 1— PROPOSED SPRINTER FUNDING PLAN A: With Passage of Proposition 1B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated SPRINTER Cost Overrun ($98.60)</th>
<th>Funding Plan</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposition 1B STA</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD Original TransNet Measure Balance</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD FY 2007 STA</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD Transportation Development Act (TDA) Carryover</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TransNet Extension</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remaining Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If NCTD is able to mitigate the risk and hold the cost increase below the $98.6 million, we are proposing to credit the funding in the following order:

1. TDA Carryover
2. TransNet Extension
3. NCTD FY 2007 STA
4. Proposition 1B STA

Figure 2 consists of the funding plan in the event that Proposition 1B does not receive voter approval in the coming general election.
FIGURE 2—PROPOSED SPRINTER FUNDING PLAN B: Without Passage of Proposition 1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated SPRINTER Cost Overrun ($98.60)</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>NCTD Original TransNet Measure Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NCTD FY 2007 STA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NCTD TDA Carryover</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Original NCTD Bond Proceeds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TransNet Extension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remaining Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If NCTD is able to mitigate the risk and hold the cost increase below the $98.6 million, the funding would be credited in the following order:

1. TDA Carryover
2. TransNet Extension
3. NCTD FY 2007 STA

**TransNet Extension Ordinance Amendment**

As noted in the SPRINTER financial plan options above, a key component of the plan is an amendment to the Ordinance to include the completion of the SPRINTER as an eligible project in the Expenditure Plan. The Ordinance as approved by the voters in November 2004 includes (Section 2(A)(1)(b)(10)) a total of $197 million in capital costs (net of mitigation costs) for “SR 78 Corridor SPRINTER/BRT service providing high-quality, east-west transit service improvements by upgrading and extending the SPRINTER rail line, providing BRT service along the Palomar Airport Road corridor, or a combination of the two.” The $197 million in total capital costs was to be funded with TransNet funds combined with state/federal funds based on the overall 50/50 match rate assumed in the Ordinance.

The Ordinance (Section 4(E)(1)) also specifies that:

Priority shall be given to projects included in the Expenditure Plan for Proposition A as passed by the voters in 1987 that remain uncompleted, such as the eastern ends of the SR 52 and SR 76 highway improvement projects and the Mid-Coast light rail transit project. The Commission shall ensure that sufficient funding or bonding capacity remain available to implement such projects as expeditiously as possible once the environmental clearance for these projects is obtained and needed state and federal matching funds are committed.

At the time the Ordinance was developed, the current SPRINTER project was considered to be fully funded and therefore was not specified as a project to be funded in the Expenditure Plan.
The amendment would change the wording of the project in the Expenditure Plan, as described above, to read “SR 78 Corridor SPRINTER/BRT service providing high-quality, east-west transit service improvements by completing the initial SPRINTER rail project and upgrading and extending the SPRINTER rail line ...” A similar change to the project tables attached to the Ordinance would be required as well.

The advantage of the Ordinance amendment approach is that the additional costs for the SPRINTER would be coming out of the funding set aside for transit improvements in the same corridor, avoiding the need to cut back planned improvements in other parts of the region. The disadvantage is that the funding available for future improvements to the SPRINTER and/or BRT services in the corridor would be significantly reduced.

The Ordinance may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the SANDAG Board of Directors, with the exception of a few provisions that can only be amended by the voters. One of the roles of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) (Paragraph #4 of the ITOC Ordinance language) is to provide recommendations to the SANDAG Board regarding any proposed amendments to the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. For this reason, this issue was discussed at last month’s ITOC meeting. While ITOC did not raise any major objections to the concept of an Ordinance amendment at that time, ITOC deferred any formal action until its November 15, 2006, meeting in order to review the financial impacts of the proposed changes on the delivery of the EAP.

To move forward with the implementation of the SPRINTER financial plan, the first reading of the Ordinance amendment could be scheduled as early as the November 17, 2006, Board of Directors meeting, with the second reading and adoption at the December 15, 2006, meeting.

**Additional Proposed Revisions to the TransNet EAP**

The SANDAG Board approved the Plan of Finance for the EAP in December 2005. As originally envisioned, the Plan of Finance update process would involve, at a minimum, annual updates in the fall of each year to reflect prior fiscal year actual data. More frequent updates would be undertaken as needed based on significant new information.

With the potential new revenue from the pending infrastructure bond measure, we may have an opportunity to amend the EAP to advance some additional projects. Matching funds provided by the bond measure could allow some key transit projects to be accelerated. Additional EMP expenditures could allow us to accelerate the delivery of additional major corridor projects and put SANDAG in a better position to compete for additional bond funds. For these reasons, the following components are proposed to be included as part of an update to the Plan of Finance for the EAP over the next two months:

- Update the approved Plan of Finance for the EAP to replace the estimated revenues and expenditures for FY 2006 with actual revenue and expenditure data now that the fiscal year has been completed.

- Include the additional TransNet funds needed to fully fund the SPRINTER based on the SPRINTER financial plan options. Once the November election results are known, a refined SPRINTER financial plan can be developed.
• Include additional EMP mitigation cost estimates to reflect the total mitigation costs for the corridors included in the EAP and to meet the Board-approved guidelines for implementing the EMP. This analysis would be used to determine financial feasibility only. Actual expenditures would be tied to successful negotiation of a Master Agreement with the wildlife agencies.

• Include Trolley capital improvements. Potential near-term capital improvements to the Trolley system (including the acquisition of new low-floor vehicles, the rehabilitation of existing Trolley vehicles, and station upgrades on the Blue and Orange lines to provide platform retrofits for low-floor vehicles and shelter modifications) would be examined for financial feasibility. The inclusion of these projects in the EAP would be contingent upon the passage of Proposition 1B, since matching funds from the bond measure would be required.

This near-term analysis work will be used to update the Plan of Finance for the EAP to verify the financial feasibility of adding funding for the SPRINTER, additional environmental mitigation funding, and potential funding for the Trolley improvements to the EAP. The analysis will reflect the availability of additional funding from the infrastructure bond measure if passed by the voters in November.

In addition to this near-term Plan of Finance update work, staff will be conducting additional work on the Plan of Finance as part of the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This analysis would be conducted over the next year and would be used to identify the next tier of projects to be added to the EAP.

Following today’s discussion of these issues, the proposed schedule for the near-term Plan of Finance analysis and the potential Ordinance amendment is as follows:

November 15 – ITOC – further discussion of the SPRINTER Financial Plan, progress on the Plan of Finance analysis work, and comments/recommendations on an Ordinance amendment.

November 17 – Board of Directors – discussion of the issue and first reading of the Ordinance amendment (optional date – December 1, 2006, Board of Directors Policy Meeting).

December 15 – Board of Directors – second reading and adoption of the Ordinance amendment and potential amendment to the EAP to include additional EMP and Trolley capital improvement expenditures based on the Plan of Finance analysis work.

CRAIG H. SCOTT
TransNet Program Manager

Key Staff Contact: Craig Scott, 619-699-1926, csc@sandag.org
COST IMPLICATIONS OF NEW EMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR OFF-ROAD DIESEL ENGINES

File Number 1200100

Introduction

Airborne particulate matter (PM) smaller than 10 micrometers (about 1/7th the thickness of a human hair) have been linked to variety of respiratory health concerns in both adults and children. In California, off-road diesel engines used for mining and construction produce approximately 19 tons of PM daily. It is estimated that a total of 102 tons of PM is produced daily from all mobile engine sources. To address this health concern, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) will be implementing new regulations designed to reduce PM from off-road diesel engines. The goal is to reduce PM emissions by 75 percent by 2010 and 85 percent by 2020. It is estimated that the cost of the new regulations to San Diego regional transportation programs will be approximately $200 million.

Discussion

In year 2000, CARB introduced the Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel–Fueled Engines and Vehicles. The plan outlines new diesel fuel regulations, more stringent standards for new equipment, and a program to retrofit the existing off-road engines. The plan also outlines a schedule for phasing out older, high emission engines.

The CARB has already put into place regulations for diesel fuel. As of September 1, 2006, diesel fuel sold in California is required to be Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel. These regulations have reduced sulfur content by 97 percent, from 500 parts per million to 15 parts per million. Regulations focusing on the equipment are expected to be approved by CARB in January 2007.

Meeting the Challenge

The construction industry is concerned that it will be difficult and costly to meet the reduction requirements. Existing engines will need to be retrofit or replaced. Retrofit devices, known as Verified Diesel Emission Control Systems (VDECS), are still being developed. So far, only one VDECS has been approved for use. Replacing existing engines and equipment will be expensive and there also may be supply issues. Construction equipment manufactures may not be able to keep up with the demand for newer, cleaner equipment.

Fleet averaging will be a method used by CARB to monitor the construction industry. Fleet averaging will require the owner of a fleet to meet average emission targets for the entire fleet rather than meeting targets for an individual piece of equipment. If the owner cannot meet the fleet requirements, the owner must show that “Off-Ramp” requirements are being met. The “Off-Ramp” requirements define a schedule for retrofitting and retiring equipment until emission targets are met. In general, the “Off-Ramp” requirements phase out existing fleet equipment starting in the year 2013 at a rate of 10 percent each year.
**“Off-Ramp” Requirements for Fleets Not Meeting Emission Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>Retrofit engines older than five years with latest available VDECS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2020</td>
<td>Annually replace or retire 10% of fleet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VDECS = Verified Diesel Emission Control System*

CARB recognizes that regulations may have a greater impact on small fleet owners so they have allowed additional time for small fleets to comply with the regulations.

**Cost Implications**

CARB has estimated the costs to be in the range of $3 billion to $4 billion for reducing the emissions of off-road diesel engines in California. In contrast, the construction industry estimates the costs could be as much as $14 to $16 billion. These costs will be reflected in the construction bid prices for projects using off-road diesel engines. Assuming the true cost is somewhere in between CARB and the construction industry's estimate, and the San Diego region's share of the statewide cost is 12 percent, and transportation project construction is 15 percent of all construction, the cost to the region's transportation programs would be approximately $200 million. The 2003 Regional Transportation Plan estimates approximately $20 billion of transportation capital program expenditures between 2006 and 2020. This translates to an approximate one percent increase in cost to each capital transportation project in the San Diego region.

**JACK BODA**  
Director of Mobility Management and Project implementation

Key Staff Contact: Dean Hiatt, (619) 699-6978, dhi@sandag.org
STATE ROUTE 163/FRIARS ROAD INTERCHANGE PROJECT UPDATE

Introduction

In 2002, the City of San Diego received a $2.239 million allocation from SANDAG to study potential improvements to the State Route (SR) 163/Friars Road Interchange. The City of San Diego has worked with Caltrans staff, SANDAG staff, and consultants from Dokken Engineering to develop a comprehensive strategy for improving this congested interchange.

Discussion

The project scope would modify the SR 163/Friars Road Interchange to improve traffic flow, pedestrian safety, and bicycle safety. Key features include widening of Friars Road between Ulric Street and Frazee Road, adding sidewalks to both sides of the Friars Road Bridge, restriping lanes, adding a southbound SR 163 auxiliary lane from Genesee Avenue to westbound Interstate 8, reconfiguring the on- and off-ramps, installing new traffic signals and improving signal timing of existing signals.

The $2.239 million allocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding from SANDAG was matched with $0.290 million in local funding from the City of San Diego to bring the total budget for the studies to $2.529 million. Studies have focused on traffic, preliminary engineering, and environmental impacts. Studies began in 2002 and as progress continued the project scope was expanded to include large portions of the adjacent freeway and surrounding local streets. Challenges addressed in the analysis include ensuring safe weaving distances between the on- and off-ramps and movement between Friars Road and Interstate 8.

The required Project Report and Environmental Document for the project is now 75 percent complete. California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act approvals are scheduled for early 2008. The schedule for the project is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Route 163/Friars Road Interchange Improvements</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>2002 – 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2010 – 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is anticipated that the project would be constructed in three phases. Phase 1 would include the Friars Road widening and the on- and off-ramp modifications. Phase I also includes intersection improvements and the installation of new traffic signals. Phase 2 would include modifications to southbound SR 163 including the construction of a collector bridge over the San Diego River and an Ulric Street “flyover” bridge. Phase 3 would include the construction of new freeway auxiliary lanes. The cost estimate for the project is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Estimate (2006 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$18 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Construction</td>
<td>$38 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Construction</td>
<td>$65 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 Construction</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$136 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contacts: Richard Chavez, (619) 699-6989, rch@sandag.org
Patti Boekamp, City of San Diego
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 a copy of a very recent Letter to the Editor of the Union-Tribune published Tuesday for each of you board members. SANDAG should have some input on where this new stadium is going to be located after all you will end up being responsible for the transportation infrastructure no matter who first pays for it. The Chargers are interested in what makes economic sense for them not what is best for the taxpayers. It is SANDAG's job to do that, is this not correct? Do not want to see the Chargers leave the region, but the bottom line has to work the taxpayers too.

Thank you for listening and the opportunity to speak
Letters to the editor

October 31, 2006

Qualcomm site makes most economic sense

After reading “S.D. to stay on sidelines as cities court Chargers” (Local, Oct. 27), my mind began to wonder who is looking out for the taxpayers' best interestes. Many millions of dollars were spent to have the trolley serve Qualcomm Stadium and now we are going to abandon that effort because the Chargers want a new stadium at some other location. A new stadium should be built at the Qualcomm site because there are many more income-generating events there than just the Chargers. Why is our new strong mayor so willing to let these income-generating situations go outside the city without some kind of fight? It is no wonder the city is going broke.

CHUCK LUNGERHAUSEN
San Diego
October 27, 2006 SANDAG Public Comment

With 2 Billion Dollars for highway improvements on Route 805, it would appear that needs for automobile drivers are a TOP PRIORITY for SANDAG and with MULTIMILLIONS for the GREEN LINE Trolley that has now been reduced to a BUS STOP for the #13 bus at GRANTVILLE, isn’t it time to focus on the Bus portion of the Transportation System that parallels the GREEN LINE? The MTS Planners, THAT DON’T RIDE BUSES, have successfully convinced the MTS and SANDAG Boards, which consist of Mayors and Council Members of the 18 cities in the County of San Diego that are members of SANDAG plus members of the County Board of Supervisors, WHO ALSO DON’T RIDE BUSES, that they have a perfect bus system.

After spending a great deal of time during the last nearly 16 months at SANDAG, MTS, and at the San Diego City Council, trying to convince them to correct the TIMING of the buses in order to allow time for passengers to transfer from the GREEN LINE Trolley to the BUSES that serve the areas between trolley stops, there has been no action, and no indication that action will be taken.

As early as July 15, 2005, I reported that the buses were scheduled to leave the trolley stops on the Eastbound GREEN LINE about 3 minutes before the trolley arrived, thus forcing a nearly 30 minute wait for the next bus. The only way to allow CONNECTIONS between the trolley and the buses is to DELAY the start time for the buses by 5 minutes to allow transfer time between the trolley and the bus. This would reduce the wait time from 30 minutes to either 5 minutes or 20 minutes between the 15 minute FIXED frequency of the trolleys and the 30 minute VARIABLE frequency of the buses. It would also allow time for riders from other bus routes to make connections to the #14 bus.

This change would require printing new bus schedules with the revised timing and would be a great deal less expensive than the 2 billion dollars for route 805.

It’s time to provide good service for bus users. Allowing them to get to their destinations in a timely manner will also increase ridership.

More changes for bus routes are scheduled for January. With only one meeting per month for MTS and SANDAG, what are the possibilities you members of the SANDAG and MTS Boards could support this request to DELAY THE STARTING TIMES on the bus schedule for the bus paralleling the GREEN LINE trolley to allow these transfers I have been requesting? 16 months of NO CONNECTIONS should be long enough.

Taking buses is inconvenient and time consuming. INTERLINING has created late buses and buses that have missed entire areas of the route because drivers have made the wrong turns. This is the ONLY mode of transportation for a large number of people and this change to the BUS TIMING that I am requesting would be a welcome improvement in the lives of these users.

Don Stillwell, 6308 Rancho Mission Road #173, San Diego, CA 92108 (619) 282-7760
# Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

## Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTP Goal</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Average work trip travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average daily travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average work trip travel speed by mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Percentage of work/school trips within 30 minutes by mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of non-work trips within 15 minutes by mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Daily vehicular crash rate per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congested peak period travel conditions (percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congested daily travel conditions (percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily hours of delay (per 1000 vehicle miles traveled) on the regional freight network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Out-of-pocket user costs (per trip)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 30-year public and private travel costs (per trip)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability</td>
<td>Percentage of peak-period trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work trip mode split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of daily trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average trip distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Smog-forming pollutants per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-road fuel consumption (gallons) per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily transit passenger miles per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constrained lands consumed for new transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Average travel time (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of work/school trips within 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of non-work trips within 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft 2007
Regional Transportation Plan
Performance Measures

Transportation Committee
November 3, 2006

Performance Measures

- Evaluate performance of network
- Provide information on regionwide basis
- Benchmark progress toward meeting the plan’s policy goals & objectives
Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC)

- Ad Hoc working group formed in December 2005
- Representatives from:
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group
  - Caltrans
  - Cities/County Technical Advisory Committee
  - Metropolitan Transit System
  - North County Transit District
  - Regional Freight Working Group
  - Regional Housing Working Group
  - Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
  - Regional Planning Technical Working Group

Total vs. Per Capita

- Daily vehicular crashes
- Smog forming pollutants
- On-road fuel consumption
- Daily vehicle miles traveled
- Daily transit passenger miles
New Measures

- Daily hours of delay on the regional freight network
- Daily trips within ¼ mile of a transit stop
- Average trip distance

Other Modifications

- Percentage of jobs within ¼ mile of a transit stop
- Percentage of homes within ½ mile of a transit stop
**Recommendation**

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the performance measures for use in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan.

**Questions & Comments**
Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Performance Measures

Transportation Committee
November 3, 2006
Oceanside - Escondido Rail Project
SPRINTER Project Status Report
SANDAG Transportation Committee
November 3, 2006

Presentation Overview

- Project overview
- Current status of construction contracts
- Review of construction progress
- Budget status
- Project control measures
- Schedule assessment
SPRINTER Rail Project Description

- Complete new 22 mile light rail transit line.
- Serves NCTD’s heaviest transit corridor – the HWY 78 corridor.
- 15 stations including Cal State San Marcos, Palomar College, and Mira Costa College (via shuttle).
- Project includes all new track, signals, grade crossings, stations
- 12 DMU vehicles based on latest European technology
- New Vehicle Maintenance Facility.
SPRINTER Operating Plan and Service Levels

- December, 2007 Target Service Date
- 30-minute frequency between 4:00AM and 10:00PM.
- FRA “Shared Use Waiver” based on “Temporal Separation”, like Trolley’s Blue Line.
- Connects with NCTD’s existing major transit centers in the Oceanside – Escondido corridor.
- SANDAG projects daily ridership of 10,300 in first year, 15,200 daily by 2015.
- Service operated under contract with Veolia Transportation.

STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS
### Contract Percent Completion

#### Percent Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMF</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMU</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Sep</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Nov</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Change Order Percent to Date

#### Change Order Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Change Order Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMF</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMU</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Progress to Date:

- **Mainline Contract:**
  - 18.5 miles of new ballasted track, out of 32 total
  - 32 of 37 grade crossings completed
  - Station platform work underway at multiple stations

- **Loop Contract:**
  - All five bridges on San Marcos Loop substantially complete.
  - Barham Lane construction is complete and in use.

- **Vehicle Maintenance Facility:**
  - Entire building exterior, most tracks complete
  - Building systems, interior finishes under way
  - Beneficial occupancy began August 15th
Mainline Progress Photos

CSUSM Loop Progress Photos
Vehicle Maint. Facility Progress Photos

VEHICLES (DMU) STATUS:
DMU CONTRACT

- Contract provides 12 Siemens VT642 “Desiro” DMU’s using latest European technology.
- Cars seat 130 passengers.
- Ten cars now complete and on property.
- “Static testing” and preliminary “dynamic” testing underway.
- Contract completion for all 12 cars expected by November 2006.

DMU Progress Photos
### Project Budget and Funding Sources

Current Funding Sources based on $385.6 M budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Millions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet 1</td>
<td>$100.3</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Bonds</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal FFGA</td>
<td>$152.1</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project Budget to be updated upon FTA approval of Amended Recovery Plan.
### BUDGET STATUS – as of Sept. 30 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approved Budget*</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>% Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMU’s</td>
<td>$ 52.2 M</td>
<td>$ 40.6 M</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline &amp; Loop</td>
<td>166.3 M</td>
<td>113.8 M</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>29.3 M</td>
<td>6.3 M</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Facility</td>
<td>23.8 M</td>
<td>18.2 M</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Prior</td>
<td>43.4 M</td>
<td>43.4 M</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Except Finance</td>
<td>67.9 M</td>
<td>59.6 M</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$382.9 M</td>
<td>$281.9 M</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>2.7 M</td>
<td>-0.1 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$385.6 M</td>
<td>$281.8 M</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budget to be updated upon FTA approval of Amended Recovery Plan.

### Recent Project Budget Actions

- NCTD adopted increase of $55 M in June, for total of $440 million.
- Transportation Committee reviewed and unanimously supported the $440 M budget for funding.
- FTA reviewed NCTD’s $440 M budget and assigned higher value to identified risks:
  - Forecast cost increase of $98.6M
  - Total cost forecast of $484.2 M
- FTA asked NCTD to show how we would further control and reduce project risks
On-going Project Control Measures

- On-going formal Partnering Sessions and weekly senior management meetings with Contractor;
- Use VECP clauses of contracts where feasible to reduce costs;
- Evaluate schedule monthly using Critical Path Method.
- All proposed changes to include a change order evaluation and negotiation of cost and profit rate.

Added Project Control Measures

- Addition of start-up, cost controls, and schedule forecasting staff, and SANDAG oversight.
- Integrated schedule for all known project activities and durations leading to start-up.
- Monthly updated forecasts of cost-to-complete.
- Critical Path Method, earned-value analysis, efficiency analysis, manpower analysis, and payment application analysis used as project control techniques;
- Detailed sub-schedules and reporting for all critical activities on key systems components.
- Re-evaluation of cost risks at contract milestone achievements.
Cash-Flow Status

- Final Amended Recovery Plan submitted to FTA for approval in September.
- FTA released $5.6 million in September based on progress to date.
- FTA released another $14.4 million in October.
- These amounts satisfied NCTD’s project cash flow needs in September and October.
- This has postponed need to use SANDAG commercial paper program.

SCHEDULE ASSESSMENT
Schedule Assessment

- Loop – January 2007 completion anticipated.
- VMF Contract – December 2006 substantial completion anticipated - 3 months early.
- DMU’s – November 2006 scheduled delivery for final DMU.

SANDAG Oversight

- SANDAG’s new role on the SPRINTER: Monitor overall progress and report to the Transportation Committee on the project’s schedule, cost & quality
- Provide an independent assessment of schedule & cost
SANDAG Oversight

Examine the effectiveness of the project team including:

- Technical abilities
- Overall organizational structure
- Communication & reporting of issues
- Working relationships

Schedule

- Construction Manager’s (CM) role has been expanded to create a master project schedule of all activities
- Sufficient controls are now in place to track and predict project completion
- Mainline construction & start-up activities currently control completion
- Current master schedule forecasts completion in January 2008
Schedule

- Completion by target date of December 2007 is achievable assuming:
  - Selective acceleration of the mainline contractor
  - Additional overlap of work between mainline contractor and start-up activities
  - Development of “work arounds” to mitigate construction or regulatory delays
  - No substantial rain delays or other major setbacks

Cost

- Construction cost controls are in place to monitor and predict construction costs
- Other controls to monitor vehicle, CM, design, insurance, staff, environmental, & start-up costs are still under development
- Once complete, NCTD will have a “Living” cost to complete that should be accurate within 2-3%
- Initial cost to complete expected this month
Amended Recovery Plan

FTA conducted a workshop with NCTD last summer to develop an Amended Recovery Plan to establish a "not to exceed" final cost and completion date.

The biggest risks to budget were identified:
- Claims
- Clean up work
- Additional CM and design
- Communication systems
- Change orders
- Start-up and systems testing

This FTA workshop concluded NCTD should fund another $53.4 M of contingency in case these risks are realized.

Amended Recovery Plan

- FTA’s “not to exceed” final cost: $484.2M
- FTA’s “not to exceed” completion: July 2008
- NCTD has developed mitigations to reduce these budget and schedule risks
- None of the biggest risks have come to fruition
GBO2  vice 12/07 or 1/08???
Garry Bonelli, 10/30/2006

GBO3  vice 12/07 or 1/08???
Garry Bonelli, 10/30/2006

GBO4  vice 12/07 or 1/08???
Garry Bonelli, 10/30/2006

GBO5  vice earlier dates???
Garry Bonelli, 10/30/2006
**Schedule Forecasts and Budget Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REVENUE OPERATIONS DATE FORECASTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Service Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Schedule Forecast:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Amended Recovery Plan Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BUDGET REVISIONS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current FTA Approved Budget (2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$385.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Adopted Budget June 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$440.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Amended Recovery Plan Budget Based on FTA-Identified Risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$484.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality**

- Each construction contractor has developed quality control plans
- NCTD tracks quality via Non-conformance reports
- NCTD’s has an independent quality manager that does not report to the CM
- DMU testing is now underway
- NCTD has sufficient controls in place to monitor quality
Organizational Effectiveness

- NCTD has expanded their project team by adding positions for a start-up manager, cost and office engineers, a regulatory coordinator, and a project controls director.
- NCTD’s organizational structure is adequate to manage this project.
- Their communication and reporting process is adequate.
- They have a productive partnering relationship with their construction contractors.

Project Concerns

- Railroad signaling and communication design and construction could delay pre-revenue training by the operator.
- City traffic signal pre-emption at grade crossings needs to be expedited.
- Designer needs to implement management controls to ensure quality & timely redesigns that are within budget.
- Cost/schedule impacts from change orders needs to be addressed.
Next Steps

- Implement additional cost control measures & develop a living cost to complete
- Develop project metrics that will measure the overall health of the project
- Develop an accelerated project schedule that meets the December 2007 completion date
- Investigate any regulatory issues that may impact cost & schedule

Summary

- Schedule: Winter ’07-’08 achievable
- Cost: Still a concern as further controls still being developed. However, mitigations are effective
- Quality: No concerns
- Organizational Effectiveness: No concerns
Cost Implications of New Emission Requirements for Off-Road Diesel Engines

Transportation Committee Report
November 3, 2006

Historic Key Events in Air Quality

- 1959 legislation enacted to establish air quality standards
- 1967 California Air Resources Board (CARB) was created by Governor Ronald Reagan
- 1988 California Clean Air Act signed by Governor Deukmejian
- 2000 California Air Resources Board adopts the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan
Diesel Emissions Reduction Plan

- Adopted in 2000
  - 75% risk reduction by 2010
  - 85% risk reduction by 2020

Multiple Strategies

- Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel Fuel
- Verified Diesel Emissions Control Systems (VDECS)
- Re-Powering Existing In Use Equipment
- Replace Old Equipment
Performance Requirements

- Fleet Averaging
- Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) Off-Ramp

Retrofit engines older than five years with latest available VDECS*

Annually replace or retire 10% of fleet

BACT “Off-Ramp” Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 2013</td>
<td>Retrofit engines older than five years with latest available VDECS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - 2020</td>
<td>Annually replace or retire 10% of fleet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* VDECS = Verified Diesel Emission Control System
Costs to Implement

- California Air Resources Control Board Estimate
  - $3 to $4 Billion
- Construction Industry Estimate
  - $14 to $16 Billion
- Average
  - Midpoint between $3 and $16 Billion or;
  - $200 Million or 1% increase in cost to transportation projects

Cost Implications of New Emission Requirements for Off-Road Diesel Engines

Transportation Committee Report
November 3, 2006
State Route 163/Friars Road Interchange

Vicinity Map
Project Features

- Widen Friars Road
- Widen State Route 163
- Improve Connections with Interstate 8
- New Bridge Crossing San Diego River
- New On-Ramp “Flyover” Bridge
- Improved Pedestrian & Bicycle Crossings

Visual Simulations

Southbound SR 163 Lane Addition
Phase 1

- Widen Friars Road
- Modify Intersections
- Modify Ramp Connection

Phase 2

- Add Southbound Lane
- New “Flyover” Bridge
- New Bridge over San Diego River
Phase 3

New Northbound Lane

Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/ROW</td>
<td>$18 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>$38 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>$65 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently programmed: $2.5 million
Funding Strategies

• Local TransNet Funds
• Developer Impact Fees
• Prop. 1B
• Federal Appropriations

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Schedule is funding dependent
## Project Schedule

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>2002 – 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/ ROW</td>
<td>2008 – 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2010 – 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## State Route 163/Friars Road Interchange