MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

TRANSNET INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (ITOC)
The ITOC may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Wednesday, October 18, 2006
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Craig Scott
(619) 699-1926
csc@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS
• OVERVIEW OF NOVEMBER BALLOT MEASURES
• I-805 CORRIDOR PROJECT UPDATE
• SPRINTER FINANCIAL PLAN OPTIONS AND THE TRANSNET PLAN OF FINANCE UPDATE PROCESS

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

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.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) members on any item at the time the ITOC is considering the item. Also, members of the public are invited to address the ITOC on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The ITOC 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 ITOC 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. MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2006 MEETING</td>
<td>ACCEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summary of the September 20, 2006 ITOC meeting has been prepared for the Committee's review. Estimated Start Time: 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the ITOC on any issue within the jurisdiction of the ITOC. Speakers will be limited to three minutes each. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item. Estimated Start Time: 9:35 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3. OVERVIEW OF NOVEMBER BALLOT MEASURES (Kim Kawada)</td>
<td>DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide a summary of the major transportation-related measures on the November statewide ballot and the potential impact to the TransNet program. Estimated Start Time: 9:40 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4. I-805 CORRIDOR PROJECT UPDATE (Joel Haven/Dave Schumacher)</td>
<td>DISCUSSION/COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans and SANDAG are jointly developing environmental documents for the I-805 corridor project, which was one of the Early Action Program (EAP) projects. Staff will provide an overview of the major project features under examination, including managed lanes, general purpose lanes, direct access ramps, transit stations, transit priority treatments, and related bus rapid transit services. Estimated Start Time: 10:10 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TRANSNET EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (Susan Brown/Craig Scott)</td>
<td>DISCUSSION/COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a continuation of last month’s discussion on the status of the SPRINT project budget, staff will review options for a financial plan to fully fund the SPRINT. These options include consideration of an amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan to include completion of the SPRINT project as part of the TransNet Extension. Staff also will outline plans for updating the TransNet Plan of Finance for the EAP to reflect the SPRINT and other related issues such as increased expenditures under the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) and the addition of improvements on the Trolley Blue and Green Lines. Estimated Start Time: 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA BASED ON CROSS-MODE COST EFFECTIVENESS (Rachel Kennedy)

At several previous meetings, ITOC has discussed the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria (TPEC) Working Group’s recommendations on revisions to the project evaluation criteria and performance indicators to be used in the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The ITOC requested consideration of criteria that would provide for an evaluation of transportation criteria across modes as opposed to the traditional approach of evaluating projects within modal categories. Staff has been looking into this issue and will update the ITOC on findings to date.

7. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE AND AGENDA TOPICS

The dates shown below have been suggested as potential meeting dates. The meetings are proposed to be scheduled from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The next meeting date and time will be confirmed at the end of each meeting. The ITOC may wish to suggest specific agenda topics for the next meeting. Potential topics for the next meeting include: the next quarterly report on the status of the major corridor projects, more detailed updates on the SR 52 and I-15 corridor projects, the process for establishing the new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) base year requirement, an update on the Environmental Mitigation Program, draft guidelines for accommodating bicycle and pedestrian travel on major transportation projects, and proposed new procedures for incorporating TransNet projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Scheduled Future Meeting Dates:
- November 15, 2006
- December 20, 2006

Potential 2007 Meeting Dates:
- January 17, 2007
- February 21, 2007
- March 21, 2007
- April 18, 2007
- May 16, 2007
- June 20, 2007
- July 18, 2007
- August 15, 2007
- September 19, 2007
- October 17, 2007
- November 21, 2007
- December 19, 2007

8. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2006
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING

September 20, 2006 Meeting Summary

Attendance-
Committee Members: ▪ Maryam Babaki ▪ Doug Gibson
▪ Hamid Bahadori ▪ John Meyer
▪ Ron Gerow ▪ Jim Ryan
Ex-Officio Members: ▪ Gary Gallegos
Others: ▪ Diane Bader, Caltrans, District 11 ▪ Jack Boda, SANDAG
▪ Jay Corrales, Move San Diego ▪ Susan Brown, SANDAG
▪ Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans District 11 ▪ Richard Chavez, SANDAG
▪ Richard Hannasch, NCTD ▪ Linda Culp, SANDAG
▪ Joel Haven, Caltrans District 11 ▪ Barrow Emerson, SANDAG
▪ Diane Hessler, NCTD ▪ Rachel Kennedy, SANDAG
▪ Alan Hoffman, Move San Diego ▪ Sookyung Kim, SANDAG
▪ Rick Howard, NCTD ▪ Jim Linthicum, SANDAG
▪ Tran Jacky, Student ▪ Jose Nuncio, SANDAG
▪ Karen King, NCTD ▪ Renee Wasmund, SANDAG
▪ Allan Kosup, Caltrans District 11 ▪ Craig Scott, SANDAG
▪ Tom Lichterman, NCTD
▪ Diane Likos, Caltrans District 11
▪ Mark Phelan, Caltrans District 11
▪ Jay Powell, City Heights CDC
▪ Steve Russell, Mid-City resident
▪ Jerome Stocks, Chair, NCTD

The following summarizes the major actions and key discussion points under each agenda item from the September 20, 2006 meeting.

Item 1 - Meeting Summary for the July 19, 2006 Meeting

The meeting summary of the July 19, 2006 regular meeting was approved as written. For major agenda items, such as the discussion of the SPRINTER project at the last meeting, Hamid Bahadori
asked that future meeting summaries include additional details on key points of discussion and major comments made by ITOC members.

**Item 2 - Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments**

There were no public comments. Hamid Bahadori distributed materials produced by the American Automobile Association (AAA) regarding the transportation-related measures coming up on the November statewide ballot. He asked that SANDAG staff provide a summary of these measures and the potential impact to the TransNet program at the next meeting. Other members concurred that such a presentation would be a good item of discussion for the October agenda.

Maryam Babaki reminded ITOC members that she was scheduled to present the ITOC Annual Report to the SANDAG Board at their next meeting. She also described efforts underway to make presentations to other groups and organizations. A presentation has been scheduled for the CTAC meeting on October 5. ITOC members also discussed the possibility of having occasional meetings in other parts of the region. John Meyer mentioned that he had made contacts for potential meeting rooms in other areas.

**Item 3 - Final ITOC Annual Report**

Maryam Babaki discussed the final ITOC Annual Report that was included in the agenda package. The final report reflected the comments made by ITOC members at the last meeting. She encouraged other ITOC members to attend the SANDAG Board of Directors meeting on September 22, 2006. The presentation on the ITOC Annual Report is on the agenda for that meeting.

**Item 4 - I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Operations Plan**

Linda Culp provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 1) summarizing the highlights of the I-15 BRT Operations Plan. Linda outlined the plans to incrementally improve transit services in the I-15 corridor as stages of the managed lanes are completed and to fully implement BRT services with the completion of the managed lanes from State Route (SR) 78 to SR 163 in 2012. ITOC members complemented the staff for developing the operating plan and identifying issues to be resolved years in advance of the planned full implementation of services. Hamid Bahadori inquired about contingency plans in the event that farebox recovery doesn’t meet projections. Linda described how components of the overall service plan could be staggered if fare revenues didn’t materialize as quickly as planned. John Meyer raised concerns about the location of some of the remote parking options and urged greater consideration of priority treatments to speed up the trip for transit vehicles to the managed lane facility and to locate parking closer to the managed lanes. He also raised concerns about multiple operators in the I-15 corridor. Linda stated that the plans call for a single operator of the BRT services even though the services would cross the North County Transit District/Metropolitan Transit System (NCTD/MTS) jurisdictional boundary. John Meyer also asked how the demand from Riverside County was going to be met. Linda described the coordination work underway with Riverside transit officials and some of the options being considered.
Steve Russell, a resident of the Mid-City area, reminded the ITOC of the community’s interest in BRT services to connect Mid-City to major job sites in Kearny Mesa and Sorrento Valley. He urged that the median BRT stations in Mid-City be implemented as soon as possible. Gustavo Dallarda described the ongoing Project Study Report (PSR) effort to analyze options for BRT services, high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes, and other improvements on I-15 in the Mid-City area. He indicated that there are some potential conflicts in the various planned improvements and that the PSR is intended to analyze the pros and cons of different options. That work should be complete by the end of the year.

**Item 5 – SR 76 Corridor Update**

Allan Kosup, Caltrans Corridor Director, provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 2) summarizing the status of the planned improvements to SR 76, one of the Early Action Program (EAP) projects. He reviewed the alternatives being considered, the environmental issues related to the project, and the schedule for development of the environmental document. As compared to the baseline schedule, the environmental process is about one year behind schedule. He reviewed some of the issues involved in the project and some of the opportunities to speed up the remaining work and get the project back on schedule. He indicated that, over the next six months, several currently outstanding issues will be resolved, and he could report back on a refined project schedule and cost.

John Meyer inquired about the impact of casino traffic on the SR 76 corridor. Allan commented that traffic on SR 76 has doubled over the past ten years due to casino traffic, as well as new homes and additional commuter traffic passing through the corridor from southern Riverside County. Gary Gallegos stressed the importance of continuing to pursue opportunities to obtain fund contributions for SR 76 upgrades from new development projects. Maryam Babaki asked why the schedule for work on the eastern portion was so far behind the middle portion. Allan and Gary explained that the work on the middle portion from Melrose Drive to Mission Road has been underway for several years. It was part of the revenue constrained RTP in 2003, while the eastern portion from Mission Road to I-15 was not. The environment document process was split into two pieces to allow the middle portion to proceed more quickly.

**Item 6 – North County Transit District (NCTD) Sprinter Project Status**

Jose Nuncio introduced the issue and described recent developments regarding the SPRINTER since the ITOC discussed the project at its July meeting. He indicated that the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) review of the project resulted in a potential budget increase of $98.6 million based on the application of higher risk factors to the remaining elements of the project. The financial plan reviewed by the ITOC at the last meeting is no longer under consideration. A new financial plan will be developed and brought back to the ITOC for review at a future meeting. In the meantime, SANDAG’s commercial paper program will be used, if needed, to meet the monthly cash flow needs of the project. He indicated that a number of NCTD representatives led by Chairman Jerome Stocks and Executive Director Karen King were present to answer questions about the project.

Tom Lichterman and Diane Hessler from NCTD provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation on the SPRINTER (Attachment 3). The presentation included an overview of the basic features of the project, the status of the ongoing construction on the project by major segment (including the
vehicle maintenance facility and the delivery of the vehicles), a review of the timeline for the project focusing on major factors contributing to the cost increases, the current budget status, and the project control measures established to minimize actual cost increases. NCTD staff also reviewed how the commercial paper funds would be used as an interim financing strategy and provided some comparison data showing that, even at the higher budget levels, the SPRINTERS's construction cost on a per-route-mile basis was significantly less than other comparable rail projects across the county.

Jim Linthicum described SANDAG’s role in providing oversight on the project controls regarding cost, schedule, and change orders. He described the recovery plan developed for the FTA as a very comprehensive and thorough document. He indicated that over the next few weeks, he would be completing his assessment of the implementation of the recovery plan and would help to refine the cost to complete the project and the completion schedule.

Hamid Bahadori indicated that he was reassured based on the presentation of the project controls that were being implemented and the oversight role that SANDAG was playing. He asked why the FTA was holding up the dollars committed to the project. NCTD Chairman Stocks reviewed some of the political pressures placed on the FTA and his view that the FTA was interested in establishing a project budget and schedule that would not be exceeded. Gary Gallegos added that the FTA’s interest in establishing a higher budget and a new financial plan to support it raises some difficult issues. He described the plan to finalize this financial plan after the November election so that, if the bond measure is successful, the additional funds can be reflected in the financial plan. He also said that a likely component of the financial plan would be the use of TransNet Extension funds. Such an action would require an amendment to the Ordinance, and the ITOC would have a role in reviewing and providing recommendations on that proposal as well.

Doug Gibson asked why the SPRINTERS wasn’t included in the TransNet Extension to begin with. Karen King explained that at the time the Ordinance was put together, the SPRINTERS was considered to be fully funded and reviewed the chronology of major changes that have occurred following the adoption of the Ordinance. John Meyer reviewed the points discussed by the ITOC regarding the SPRINTERS at the last meeting. He felt that NCTD had responded well to the concerns raised by the ITOC and had answered many of the concerns that had been raised regarding project controls. He indicated that most of his concerns had been met, but that he was still worried about the passage of the bonds in November and FTA’s release of the remaining funds for the project. He asked NCTD staff about the operating budget for the project and raised a concern that the bus services not be impacted in favor of funding SPRINTERS operations. Diane Hessler described how the operating costs were to be funded and indicated that the only bus services impacted would be those duplicative services, which would be restructured to feed into the SPRINTERS stations.

ITOC members discussed what form of an action would be appropriate given that the final funding plan for the SPRINTERS was not on the agenda at this time. The decision was to act to express a general increased level of comfort with the project at this time.

**ACTION (6-0 vote): Based on the information provided by NCTD and SANDAG staff, the ITOC expressed a greater level of comfort with the status of the SPRINTERS project and the project controls that have been instituted.**
**Item 7 - Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Performance Measures**

Rachel Kennedy reviewed the materials regarding performance measures provided as part of the agenda package. To date the ITOC has been reviewing recommendations from the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria (TPEC) Working Group on updated project evaluation criteria to be used in the development of the 2007 RTP. The next step in the TPEC’s efforts has been to review the performance measures to be used for the RTP. She reviewed the performance measures used in the last RTP and the TPEC’s recommended changes. ITOC members had no major recommendations or comments regarding the TPEC’s recommendations. John Meyer inquired about how the air pollution measure was calculated. Rachel described the modeling process involved in generating those measurements. Rachel also mentioned that the staff is continuing to research potential cross-mode, cost-effectiveness measures that the ITOC had expressed interest in at previous meetings. She indicated that some preliminary results in this area could be provided to the ITOC at the next meeting.

**Item 8 - 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Amendment No. 1**

Sookyung Kim reviewed the proposed programming changes included in the first quarterly amendment to the 2006 RTIP. Her report focused on the changes involving funding from the TransNet Extension. Craig Scott reminded the ITOC that the full listing of all RTIP amendments had been provided to the ITOC separately in advance of the meeting. Sookyung outlined the schedule for the amendment process. The amendment was scheduled for action at the October 20 Transportation Committee meeting and the October 27 Board of Directors meeting. The ITOC raised no issues or comments regarding the proposed amendments.

**Item 9 - Move San Diego FAST Plan Presentation**

Maryam Babaki indicated that she had been contacted by Move San Diego to make a presentation to the ITOC regarding the transit planning work it had been conducting. Jay Corrales from Move San Diego provided an introduction about the organization and its work on the FAST (Financially Achievable, Saves Time) Plan. Alan Hoffman presented a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 4) describing the pros and cons of transit services and plans for San Diego, reviewing alternatives being used in other areas with a focus on Brisbane, Australia, and offering a new service concept for San Diego based on the use of grade-separated busways with connecting services.

John Meyer expressed some skepticism regarding the capital cost estimates provided in the presentation, particularly due to the tunneling involved in the proposed concept. Mr. Hoffman expressed a high confidence level with the cost estimates. Jay Powell from the City Heights Community Development Corporation passed out information related to BRT services and high-occupancy-toll facilities in Northern Virginia. ITOC members expressed their appreciation to Move San Diego for their presentation and felt it contained many interesting concepts.

**Item 10 - Future Meeting Schedule and Agenda Topics**

The next regular meeting of the ITOC was scheduled for October 18, 2006, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at SANDAG. Potential agenda items for the meeting included reports from Corridor...
Directors/Project Managers on the status of several major corridor projects, a review of the proposed approach to developing the new “maintenance of effort” requirement, and a review of draft guidelines for accommodating bicycle and pedestrian travel on major transportation projects.

There were no other changes made to the regular monthly meeting schedule through the end of 2006. ITOC members discussed potential meeting dates for 2007, including the concept of moving to a bi-monthly schedule and considering holding meetings in other parts of the region. The future meeting schedule was deferred for further discussion at a future meeting.

**Item 11 - Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.
I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Operations Concept

TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee

September 20, 2006

I-15 Corridor

• 2006: MTS COA Changes

• 2007: SPRINTER
  • 2008/09: Middle ML Segment

• 2008/09: Existing Routes Use Stations
  • 2011: North ML Segment

• 2010/11: Existing Routes Use ETC and DAR
  • 2012: South ML Segment

• 2012: Full BRT
  • 2012: Transit Priority South of SR-163

Base map is draft Smart Growth Concept Map.
Significant 2015 Southbound BRT Demand

2015 Southbound Transit Demand
Estimated Data (Different Locations, Same Demand) 2015 Southbound BRT Demand
- Estimated Data (Different Locations, Same Demand)

2008 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 (DT-KM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Option 1 - 2012 BRT Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Wknd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc-Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB-Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM - Downtown (option)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP - Downtown (option)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 1 Service Concept**

Core BRT (15 min peak/30 min offpeak)

Escondido Peak BRT (10 min peak only)

Rancho Bernardo Peak BRT (10 min peak only)

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

Carmel Mountain Peak BRT - Option (30 min peak only)
Option 2 - 2012 BRT Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core I-15</td>
<td>Peak: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wknd: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc-Downtown</td>
<td>Peak: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wknd: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB-Downtown</td>
<td>Peak: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wknd: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc-SVUC</td>
<td>Peak: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wknd: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 Service Concept

Core BRT (15 min peak/30 min offpeak)

Escondido Peak BRT (15 min. peak only)

Rancho Bernardo Peak BRT (15 min. peak only)

UCSD Core BRT (10 min. peak/30 min offpeak)
### Annual Operating and Maintenance Funds - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>(millions$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current MTS I-15 Resources</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet:</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FasTrak:</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox:</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds:</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BRT Stations In 2012

- **Escondido Transit Center**
  - 2012: Parking Structure (Center for Performing Arts as backup)

- **Del Lago**
  - 2012: Kit Carson Park for Carpools

- **Rancho Bernardo**
  - 2012: Parking Structure (RB church is backup)

- **Sabre Springs**
  - 2012: Parking Structure (Branch to Rancho Penas. Or Carmel Mountain is backup)

- **Mira Mesa**
  - 2012: Parking Structure w/ College
High-Capacity Vehicles

- Operations plan calls for high-capacity vehicles to meet demand
- SANDAG/MTS/NCTD Vehicle Procurement Committee
- Storage facility in northern corridor (Escondido) to be evaluated

TransNet Capital Funds

- $75 million Stations
- $30 million Vehicles (20% spares, replacements)
- $105 million Direct Access Ramps
- $210 million Subtotal
- $160 million Project contingency, construction management, design
- $370 million Total

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

- Improvements south of SR-163
- Determine best station for Riverside ridership (e.g., ETC or north)
- Storage Facility
- Central BRT Maintenance Facility
- Vehicle Procurement
- Phasing in Sorrento Mesa service
- Continue to work with MTS, NCTD, and Caltrans to detail service concept and address funding shortfalls
SR-76 Corridor

Allan Kosup
Corridor Project Director

Mark Phelan
Project Manager

Early Action Projects

Tier 1 Projects
1. SR 76 - Widening
2. SR 52 - New Freeway
3. Mid-Coast LRT - Super Loop

Tier 2 Projects
4. I-15 Managed Lanes & BRT - North and South Extension
5. SR 52 - HOV/Managed Lanes (Reversible)
6. I-15 North Coast Corridor - Environmental Effort
7. I-805 Corridor - Environmental Effort & BRT

TransNet

February 2006
76 Corridor Opportunities and Constraints

A commitment to “net ecological benefit”

Wetland Habitat

Species Protection

River Park Coordination

Cultural Resources

76 “MIDDLE”

Identify Alternatives and Solutions

Environmental Engineering Studies

Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits

Quantify Costs

Draft ED to Public

Stakeholder Consensus on Preferred Alternative

Draft ED to Public

Begin Early Design

Design Project

Acquire R/W

76 “EAST”

Identify Alternatives and Solutions

Environmental Engineering Studies

Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits

Quantify Costs

Draft ED to Public

Stakeholder Consensus on Preferred Alternative

Draft ED to Public

Begin Early Design

Design Project

Acquire R/W

Corridor Complete

Where are we now?
Integration and Synergy

76 “Middle” Study Alternatives

Proposed County River Park

Where are we now?

Identify Alternatives and Solutions

Environmental Engineering Studies Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits Quantify Costs

Draft ED to Public

Stakeholder Consensus on Preferred Alternative

Draft ED to Public

Begin Early Design

Design Project Acquire R/W

FED/ROD

Corridor Complete

---

76 “MIDDLE”

76 “EAST”

Identify Alternatives and Solutions

Environmental Engineering Studies Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits Quantify Costs

Draft ED to Public
Where are we now?

Stakeholder Consensus on Preferred Alternative

Draft ED to Public

Begin Early Design

Design Project
Acquire R/W

FED/ROD

Environmental Engineering Studies
Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits
Quantify Costs

76 "MIDDLE" - 76 "EAST"

Where are we going?

6-12 Month Look Ahead

Stakeholder Consensus on Preferred Alternative

Draft ED to Public

Begin Early Design

Design Project
Acquire R/W

FED/ROD

Environmental Engineering Studies
Quantify Impacts

Analyze Benefits
Quantify Costs

76 "MIDDLE" - 76 "EAST"
## 76 Corridor Baseline Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Middle”</th>
<th>“East”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Enviro. Document</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Ground</td>
<td>Late 2007</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Risks and Opportunities

- Scope of Stakeholder Concerns
- Obtaining Alignment Consensus
- Net Ecological Benefit
- Impact of Environmental work windows
- Right of Way acquisition

- Construction Administration
- Construction Staging
- Early Right of Way Acquisition
- Advance mitigation and Design
- NEPA Delegation
SR-76 Corridor Estimate (figures in $ millions)

- Support: 112.0
- Construction Capital: 254.0
- Right of Way Capital: 80.0
- Mitigation/Enhancement: 74.0

Questions/Comments?
Purpose of Presentation

Provide an informational report to ITOC on SPRINTERS project status and cost issues.
Presentation Overview

- NCTD and the SPRINTER project
- Current status of progress and construction
- Review of factors affecting project cost
- Additional cost control measures
- Current cash flow needs
- Conclusions on project progress and cost effectiveness
NCTD Brief Overview

- Multi-modal public transit agency for 8 cities and the County in Northern San Diego County.
- 1,000 square mile service area.
- Started service 1976.
- 53 “BREEZE” bus routes.
- ADA and general public demand response.
- COASTER commuter rail operator since 1995, under contract.
- 11.7 million annual riders, all modes combined.
- Responsibility to operate and maintain the entire LOSSAN rail corridor within San Diego County.

SPRINTER Rail Project

- 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.
- All vehicles begin and end service at new Maintenance Facility in Escondido.
- 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.

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>
CURRENT STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION

Four Major Contracts

Contract Values

- Mainline: $182.4
- Loop: $23.5
- VMF: $23.6
- DMU: $50.6
Contract Percent Completion

Percent Complete

- Mainline: 53.4%
- Loop: 72.5%
- VMF: 66.1%
- DMU: 61.0%

Net Change Order % through August

Change Order Value

- Mainline: 4.6%
- Loop: 0.6%
- VMF: 0.9%
- DMU: 7.1%
Progress to Date:

- 17 miles of new ballasted track constructed to date of the 32 miles total
- 32 of 37 grade crossings completed
- Two new concrete bridges installed
- Station platform work underway at multiple stations
- Numerous retaining walls and drainage ditches.
- Test track at east end of line completed
- Includes Inland Rail Trail for SANDAG, Detention Basin Walls for Oceanside (reimbursable projects)
El Camino Real Grade Crossings

El Camino Grade Crossings and Basin Wall
New Loma Alta Creek RR Bridges

New track in San Marcos, Rail Trail adjacent
Double-Track Construction at Vista Transit Ctr

Inland Rail Trail Construction – San Marcos
Progress to Date:
- All five bridges on San Marcos Loop nearly complete.
- Barham/La Moree Bridge includes CSUSM station on elevated platform.
- Barham Lane utility work complete and road paving is 80% complete.
- Contract expected to be completed in late November 2006.
Rancheros Bridge rises to cross HWY 78

Rancheros Bridge span over HWY 78
Westerly bridge over HWY 78

Barham Drive Bridge to CSUSM
**VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY**

**Progress to Date:**
- Rapid progress since Contract award in September 2005.
- Maintenance pits, building slab, structural steel all completed by May.
- Roof complete, walls up in June.
- Entire building shell and tracks complete in August.
- Beneficial occupancy for DMU maintenance effective August 15.

**VMF Steel going up, March - April**
VMF – Interior south pit

Western approach yard tracks - August
VMF on “DMU Unveiling” Day, Aug. 29

VEHICLES (DMU) STATUS:
**DMU CONTRACT**

- Contract is on schedule, first three cars arrived in port on August 12th.
- Five cars now complete and on property.
- Vehicle “Unveiling” on August 29th.
- Contract completion for all 12 cars expected by November 2006.
Vehicle Delivery

DMU “Unveiling” August 29th
DMU “Unveiling” August 29th

DMU on west track of Facility
Major Events Affecting Project Cost

- **1987** Proposition A (TRANSNET) – part of the program of projects, intended to provide an alternative between Oceanside – Escondido.
- **1991** - Addition of the CSUSM Loop to the project
- **1992** – Purchase of ROW, including $19.2 M for Oceanside – Escondido Line (excluding Loop).
- **1990’s** – Loop ROW acquisitions - $24.2 M
- **2000** - FTA permission to enter final design, 13 years after passage of Prop A.
Major Events Affecting Cost

- **2001** - Final design completed, budget established. NCTD begins FFGA negotiation.
- **2002** (Nov.) – State faces budget problems and freezes $80 million in TCRP funding.
- **2003** (Feb.) – FTA approves FFGA, after State makes funding commitment. This is two years after FFGA budget was developed.
- **2003** – NCTD begins exploring bridge financing options for delayed TCRP funds.
- **2004** – NCTD issues bonds to bridge delayed TCRP funds. Required special legislation.

- **2003** (Dec) – Contract awarded for DMU's, 20% higher than original estimate. Original DMU was no longer made.
- CPUC approval required 1 year to achieve.
- New vehicle is 50% longer and has higher capacity, newer technology.
Major Events Affecting Cost

- **2004 (June)** – BNSF agreement after 2+ years of negotiations.
  - BNSF refused to commit to agreement until FFGA approved.
  - Agmt provides 5-day construction workweek and weekend rail freight windows.
  - Allows project to proceed but adds a year to construction duration.

- **2004 (July)** – Mainline bids received, $6.9 M or 4.4% over budget. The four bids received are all within a 5% range, decision is made to award contract.

- **2004 (Dec)** – Loop bids received, $3.2 M or 15.8% over budget. Contract awarded, given trends in construction costs and closeness of the three bids.

- **2005 (Sep)** – Vehicle Maintenance Facility bids received, 10 days after Hurricane Katrina hit. Construction industry went wild.
  - Low bid is $7 M or 42% over the revised budget.
  - Due to market conditions and project cost and schedule impacts if re-bid, contract is awarded.
Summary of Factors Contributing to Cost Increase

In a word, “time”:

- Delays obtaining required governmental approvals (FTA, CTC, and CPUC) during period of high inflation in construction industry.
- Freight construction easement extended project duration by 1 year, increased bid cost.
- “Katrina” impact on VMF bids – used up 70% of remaining contingency in Fall 2005.
- Soft costs increased due to project duration extension.
## BUDGET STATUS – August 31 2006

Costs reported against last FTA-accepted budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>% Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMU’s</td>
<td>$ 52.2 M</td>
<td>$ 33.9 M</td>
<td>65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline &amp; Loop</td>
<td>165.4 M</td>
<td>109.5 M</td>
<td>66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>29.3 M</td>
<td>5.5 M</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Facility</td>
<td>23.8 M</td>
<td>15.5 M</td>
<td>66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Prior</td>
<td>43.4 M</td>
<td>43.4 M</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>71.4 M</td>
<td>58.1 M</td>
<td>81 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$385.6 M</td>
<td>$265.9 M</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Project Budget Actions

- May, 2006 – NCTD’s updated Cost-to-Complete indicated project increase of $42 M to $55 M.
- 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 Cost Control Measures

- Co-location of NCTD, CM, and designer at field site office;
- On-going formal Partnering Sessions and weekly senior management meetings with Contractor;
- Use VECP clauses of contracts where feasible to reduce costs;
- Assign separate CM firm Contract Manager and NCTD Project Officer for each contract;
- All proposed changes to include a change order evaluation and negotiation of cost and profit rate.
Added Control Measures

- Addition of start-up, cost controls, and schedule forecasting staff, and SANDAG oversight.
- Create integrated schedule for all known project activities and durations leading to start-up.
- Monthly updated forecasts of cost-to-complete based on earned-value and completion to date.
- Development of detailed sub-schedules and reporting for all critical activities on key systems components.
- Re-evaluation of cost risks at contract milestone achievements.

Near-Term Cash Flow Needs

- Current request for access to CP Program is to bridge timing differences for short-term project cash flow needs.
- CP is not a permanent funding source for SPRINTER
- Repayment will be done with federal Section 5309 New Starts funds.
- NCTD has executed the grant application for $66.5 million and is currently working with FTA on approval and release of first $20 million.
- Potential FTA release of $20 million would defer need for cash flow for September and October.
## Near Term Cash Flow Needs

### Sprinter Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Funding</strong></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Cash Disbursements</strong></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(11.7)</td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Funding Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(29.9)</td>
<td>(42.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONCLUSIONS
Why the SPRINTER is a solid investment:

- Even at upper end of cost estimate, total project cost of $484 M for a 22 mile new start works out to $22 M per mile.
- Lowest-cost-per-mile new start rail project of any recent project in California, and the country.
- SPRINTER is an integral part of regional public transit network, called for in TransNet 1.
- Part of the regional transportation solution in MOBILITY 2030.
- Serves NCTD’s busiest transit corridor, won’t be affected by increasing Hwy 78 congestion. This freeway difficult to widen.

Comparable Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Project</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>No. of stations</th>
<th>Capital cost</th>
<th>Capital cost/mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$484.2m</td>
<td>$22.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Line (LA)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$877.0m</td>
<td>$39.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte NC S. Corridor</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$426.9m</td>
<td>$44.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver SE Corridor</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$879.3m</td>
<td>$46.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Gold Line</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$859.0m</td>
<td>$62.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$506.0m</td>
<td>$85.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Gold E Side Ext.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$898.8m</td>
<td>$152.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Bergen, NJ</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,215.4m</td>
<td>$199.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh N Shore Ext.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$435.0m</td>
<td>$290.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- SPRINT project has made tremendous progress and is 60% complete for construction.
- Delays in starting construction in era of rapidly rising costs resulted in most of cost increase.
- Project duration extension added construction cost and resulted in soft-cost increase.
- Construction contracts have been well-managed.
- NCTD will continue to aggressively manage the project to completion and will continue to pursue every cost savings opportunity.

Questions?
Why Do Cities Invest in Transit?

"Reduce" Congestion  Improve Air Quality  Reduce Sprawl  Increase Choices

To accomplish these goals, transit must attract someone who would otherwise drive a single-passenger automobile.

But Is It a Better Choice?

Why Transit?

What about the Trolley?
Understanding the Trolley

The Good
- Politically popular
- Improvement over the city bus
- Generally positive Image

The Bad
- Match to urban form
- Match to our trip patterns
- Long travel times
- Offsets from the Station environments

The Ugly
- Expensive, long time to build
- Incompatible with our income limits
- Frequency
- Difficult to fit into many places
- Minimal diversion of auto traffic

San Diego's light rail is mostly mismatched with residential densities (outside of downtown). A trolley trip for most people involves driving—or taking a local bus—to a trolley station.

These are the connections that an effective transit plan will need to make if a transit investment is really to help the Mid-Coast corridor. Such a network would be difficult to produce with light rail.
Mission Valley

Mission Valley, because of its shape, appears to be a linear corridor, and hence well-servicable by light rail.

Actual land area within 5-minute walk of station

½ mile radius of Station

In fact, Mission Valley is much thicker than a traditional transit corridor. All but a small share of non-retail employment is within a 1/4 mile radius of a station, let alone 1/6 mile.

Major non-retail employment

What’s Left for Uptown/Mid-City?

Einstein discovers that time is actually money.

The El Cajon Boulevard Corridor has the potential to be among the highest ridership transit projects in the United States—and hence qualify for significant federal funding.
The Great Paradox

Light Rail

"The Trolley is really popular with San Diegans... they're just not riding it."
— Job Nelson, reporting on the KPBS/Competitive Edge Survey of San Diegans, Full Focus, July 2005

"The Bus"

Unloved and unloved, yet holds the greatest potential of actually solving our problems if deployed correctly... and it's still the backbone of our current plans!

"Choice Riders" on the Trolley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Trolley Riders Who &quot;Had an Auto Available&quot; for Their Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "City Bus" May Have a Slight Image Problem...
How do we get more people to ride transit?

Findings from Market Research

- Some prefer transit
- Most will use transit if and when it meets their needs:
  - "Get me from point A to point B..." 
  - ...quickly and don't make me wait, please.
- Some will never use transit

Network Structure (Connectivity)
System Performance (Time)
Customer Experience
Creating Market Value

1. Connect More Places Together More Directly
2. Make Those Connections Faster
3. Make Those Connections More Frequent
4. Make Transit Infrastructure the Center of Civic Life

ASAP
Than Driving
Show Up 'n Go
Centrality

There are many elements which create value. In short, the aim is to make transit not merely convenient or useful, but to make it indispensable.

Current Plans

Most trips are uncompetitive with the automobile
Too many key trips require multiple transfers
Too many janitorial services are built into the system

Brisbane: A Model City

We identified the best city model for San Diego:

Brisbane
Queensland, Australia

"Brisbane is now at the leading edge in urban mass transit... the new busway will attract international attention for the level of quality and customer focus that has been incorporated."
...So we hired the people who designed, built, and operate Brisbane's system.

What did they tell us?

According to Brisbane's bus service manager, most of the services using the Southeast Busway are now operating at or near full cost recovery (little or no public subsidy); some turn a profit.
What Must Transit Accomplish?

Competitiveness
- Transit must be faster than driving for key trips and competitive for a larger set of trips.

Land Use
- Transit must effectively link and activate areas of employment, and support areas of critical demand.

Markets Served
- Transit must clearly impact all segments of the market requiring transit by providing a cost-effective service experience.

Cost Efficiency
- Transit must improve overall system efficiency at the same time keeping cost per trip and efficiency at service not hurt them.

If transit is to make a major contribution to improving long-term quality of life for San Diegans, it will need to focus more intensely and strategically on a core set of tasks.

Detailed Market Analysis

The challenge in San Diego is to link dispersed origins with multiple destinations—a task ill-suited to our current implementation of light rail, and one which requires extensive "criss-crossing" of the region.

Daily commute to Palomar Airport Road (>500 commutes trips)

SCALE
- 7000 trips
- 5000 trips
- 3000 trips
- 1000 trips
- 500 trips

July 2006
Detailed Route Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Route to Bus Transfer</th>
<th>Golden Triangle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>MT1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Mateo</td>
<td>SMT2</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East San Mateo</td>
<td>SMT3</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>JSMT</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Park</td>
<td>BPN1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Automall</td>
<td>PKB1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Ranch</td>
<td>MRN1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano Ranch</td>
<td>SRN1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>SCN1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>OBN1</td>
<td>Bus to bus transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Did Our Consultants Recommend?

Our consultants reviewed existing transit services in the light of origin/destination analysis to improve the operating efficiency, directness, and usefulness of such services.

Take Advantage of Existing Light Rail

Build Quickways (Grade-Separated)
Also Use *T-Ways* (At-Grade Busways)

Use Freeways Sparingly

Use *V-Ways* ("Virtual" Busways)

Improve Heavy Rail/Commuter Rail
### Preliminary Findings

#### Work Trips
We can specify a core infrastructure project that directly targets major regional job zones.

#### Urban Form
We can better target and serve areas of high market demand and traffic & parking impacts. We better support transit-oriented development.

#### Cost Efficiency
We can improve the cost-efficiency of transit investments and transit operations.

#### "Attractiveness"
We create a more consistent approach to developing a quality infrastructure designed to be more attractive to a broad market.
What Would It Cost to Build?

Compared with the transit-only component of the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario of SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Move San Diego’s plan fits well within the scale of existing transit resources.
At last month’s meeting, the ITOC requested a presentation from staff regarding the transportation measures on the November statewide ballot. The attached material provides a summary of the key features of the ballot measures and the potential impacts for San Diego.

Staff will provide updated information on the status of the ballot measures and discuss how the passage of the measures would impact the TransNet program.

Attachment: Attachment 1 - Statewide Infrastructure Bond Measures Fact Sheet
NOVEMBER 2006 STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1A</td>
<td>Protection of Proposition 42 funds (SCA 7)</td>
<td>$ 19.925 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1B</td>
<td>Transportation, Air Quality and Port Security (SB 1266)</td>
<td>$ 19.925 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1C</td>
<td>Housing and Emergency Shelter (SB 1689)</td>
<td>$ 2.850 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1D</td>
<td>K-12/University Facilities (AB 127)</td>
<td>$ 10.416 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1E</td>
<td>Flood Prevention (AB 140)</td>
<td>$ 4.090 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 37.281 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSPORTATION

Infrastructure Bond: SB 1266 (Perata and Nuñez)

- $4.5 billion for Corridor Mobility Improvement, allocated by California Transportation Commission (CTC) for projects in highly congested corridors that expand capacity, enhance operations, or improve travel time; projects must be ready to go by 2012.
- $3.1 billion for California Ports Infrastructure, Security, and Air Quality Improvement, allocated by the CTC; includes $2 billion to fund improvements to trade corridors, $1 billion for emission reductions projects in trade corridors, and $100 million for port, harbor, and ferry terminal security improvement grants.
- $2 billion for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation, with $1.5 billion distributed by formula to the regions (STIP-RIP) and $0.5 billion for interregional improvements.
  - San Diego share: $109 million (7.3%)
- $4 billion for the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement, with $400 million for intercity rail improvements and vehicles and the remaining $3.6 billion in flexible formula funds for transit rehabilitation, replacement, safety, capital projects, bus rapid transit, and rolling stock purchase.
  - San Diego share: $222 million (6.2%), split $169 million MTS and $53 million NCTD
- $1 billion in State-Local Partnership Program, allocated by the CTC, for projects nominated by a regional transportation planning agency (RTPA); requires a dollar for dollar match of local funds.
  - TransNet projects eligible
$2 billion for **Local Street and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety**, divided equally between cities and counties; allocated by formula to local jurisdictions for the local street and road improvements that relieve congestion, improve traffic safety, prevent deterioration, and expand transit ridership.

- County of San Diego share: $70 million (7.0%)
- Cities share: $83 million total (see Table 1 below for detail by city)

$1 billion for **Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response** for projects that increase protection against security and safety threat and develop disaster response capacity for public transit systems.

$1.325 billion for other programs allocated by the CTC, including $125 million for Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit (state match to federal funds); $250 million for Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (high-priority grade crossings); $750 million Highway Safety, Rehabilitation and Preservation (SHOPP); and $200 million for School Bus Retrofit Program.

$1 billion for State Route 99 improvements through the Central Valley.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Street and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Regional Share of $1 Billion Allocated Statewide to Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposition 42 Protection - SCA 7 (Torlakson)

- Continues transfer of annual motor vehicle fuels sales tax to Transportation Investment Fund for public transit, STIP, and cities and county transportation programs.
- Retains suspension clause when (a) Governor proclaims severe state fiscal hardship; (b) Legislature enacts by 2/3rds vote a bill that does not contain any other unrelated provision; and (c) bill provides that loans must be repaid within three years.
- No more than two annual suspensions during any period of ten consecutive fiscal years.
- No new suspension can occur while any prior loan is outstanding.
- All preexisting statutory loans to be repaid over a 10-year period ending in 2016, with at least 1/10 paid each year.

Public-Private Partnerships - AB 1467 (Nuñez and Perata)

- Authorizes Caltrans and RTPAs until January 1, 2012 to enter into comprehensive development lease agreements with public and private entities or consortia for four goods movement projects (two north and two south) that may charge toll or user fees; Caltrans and RTPA nominate projects to CTC.
- Also authorizes RTPAs until January 1, 2012, to develop/operate high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes projects (four total, with two north and two south); RTPAs nominate projects to CTC in cooperation with Caltrans; CTC submits applications for approval by Legislature.
- Requires preparation of annual progress reports by Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO).

HOUSING AND LAND USE: SB 1689 (Perata and Nuñez)
Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006

$1.5 billion for Affordable Housing Program, including:
- $345 million for loans to local governments and developers for construction and rehabilitation of affordable multifamily housing.
- $295 million for various programs for homeless and disabled persons and foster youth, including $50 million for grants to counties and non-profit entities for emergency shelters and transitional homes for homeless persons; $195 million for loans to local governments and developers for supportive transitional housing for disabled and homeless persons; and $50 million for housing for homeless and emancipated foster youth.
- $135 million loans for local governments and non-profit agencies for farmworker housing.
- $625 million for various homeownership programs, including $300 million for grants and loans for local programs (Cal Home); $200 million for down payment assistance for first-time homebuyers; and $125 million for grants to local governments for down payment assistance programs, in areas where local regulatory barriers have been reduced (BEGIN Program).
- $100 million for a newly created Affordable Housing Innovation Program for grants or loans to sponsoring agencies, to be further defined by future legislation.
$1.35 billion for **Planning and Infill Incentives**, including:

- $850 million for **Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Incentives**, to be further defined by future legislation; of which no more than $200 million may be used for park development in conjunction with infill.

- $300 million in **Transit-Oriented Development and Implementation** for loans to local governments, transit agencies, and developers to develop infrastructure associated with high density transit-oriented development; projects must have 15 percent minimum affordable housing component within ¼-mile of transit.

- $200 million for **Housing Urban-Suburban-Rural Parks** for housing-related park grants, to be further defined by future legislation.
I-805 CORRIDOR PROJECT UPDATE

Caltrans and SANDAG are jointly developing environmental documents for the I-805 corridor project, which was one of the Early Action Program projects. Staff will provide an overview of the major project features under examination, including managed lanes, general purpose lanes, direct access ramps, transit stations, transit priority treatments, and related bus rapid transit services.

Attachments related to this item include:

- Attachment 1 - A copy of the Transportation Committee agenda report on this topic

Note: the attachment was not ready at the time of mailout; it will be sent under separate cover.
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TRANSNET EARLY ACTION PROGRAM

Introduction

At last month’s meeting, the ITOC received a detailed briefing on the status of the SPRINT project, including 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. The ITOC expressed a greater comfort level with the status of the project and the project controls in place.

The ITOC also reviewed the interim financial strategy regarding the use of SANDAG’s commercial paper program to cover any shortfalls in the monthly cash flow needs of the project over the next couple of months until there was greater certainty regarding the availability of funding to be provided through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the results of the November elections, and the total cost of the project. It was made clear that the ITOC would be involved in reviewing the long-term financial plan for the project as it was developed. This item reflects the next step in the process of developing that financial plan. 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 as one of the projects to be funded through TransNet Extension funds.

In addition, we are proposing two other revisions to the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) to add funding for the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) and improvements to the Trolley Blue and Green lines.

Recommendation

The ITOC should discuss the SPRINT financial plan options and provide comments 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 EAP. In addition, the ITOC should provide any comments on the proposed revision to the EAP to add funding for the EMP and improvements to the Trolley Blue and Green lines.
SPRINTER Financial Plan Options

As discussed at last month’s ITOC meeting, the SPRINTER cost increase may be as much as $98.6 million. While North County Transit District (NCTD) has taken several steps that they believe will mitigate the potential cost risks, we believe it 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 for the event that the pending infrastructure bond measure meets with voter approval and provides new formula-based revenues to NCTD that they would be able to apply to the SPRINTER overrun. Proposed Plan B prepares for 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 Funding Plan A. This plan uses $50 million out of the $53.7 million in infrastructure bond funds (Prop 1B - STA Funds) estimated to accrue to NCTD. The $3.7 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](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated SPRINTER Cost Overrun</th>
<th>($98.60)</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1-B STA</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Original TransNet Measure Balance</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FY 2007 STA</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD TDA Carryover</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Extension</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
<td></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. Prop 1-B STA

Figure 2 consists of the funding plan in the event that the Infrastructure Bonds do 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>Funding Plan</th>
<th>Estimated SPRINTER Cost Overrun ($98.60)</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD Original TransNet Measure Balance</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD FY07 STA</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD TDA Carryover</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original NCTD Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Extension</td>
<td>68.39</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
<td></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 specified 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 so 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 ITOC’s roles (Paragraph #4 of the Ordinance) is to provide recommendations to the SANDAG Board regarding any proposed amendments to the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. For this reason, the comments and recommendations of the ITOC on this issue are very important.

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 Board of Directors meeting, with the second reading and adoption at the December meeting.

Additional Proposed Revisions to the TransNet EAP

The SANDAG Board approved the Plan of Finance for the Early Action Program in December 2005. The ITOC reviewed this Plan of Finance in the fall of last year. 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 Infrastructure Bonds, we 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 us 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 program. 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 Blue and Green Line Improvements. Potential near-term capital improvements to the Trolley system would be examined for financial feasibility. These projects would be contingent upon the passage of Prop. 1B at the November election 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 mitigation funding, and potential funding for the Trolley improvements to the EAP. The analysis will reflect the availability of additional funding from the Infrastructure Bonds 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 3rd** – Transportation Committee discussion of the Ordinance amendment concept and the Plan of Finance update process
- **November 15th** – ITOC further discussion of the Sprinter Financial Plan, progress on the Plan of Finance analysis work, and comments/recommendations on an Ordinance amendment
- **November 17th** – Board of Directors discussion of the issue and first reading of the Ordinance amendment (optional date – December 1st Board of Directors Policy Meeting)
- **December 15th** – 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
Draft Potential Cross Mode Cost Effectiveness Equation
For Discussion Purposes Only

\[
\frac{[(\text{Capital} + \text{Operating} + \text{Maintenance Costs/Lifecycle}) + (\text{Personal Cost} \times \text{PMT})]}{\text{Person Miles Traveled}}
\]

**Personal Cost**
Transit - average regional transit fare/mile $0.11
Highway- AAA user cost/mile $0.502 (2002 dollars)
### Draft Cross-Mode Cost-Effectiveness Highway Analysis
For Discussion Purposes Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost/PMT (Include User Cost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Vandergrift</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F + 2ML/2HOV</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML/MB</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Del Mar Heights</td>
<td>Vandergrift</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F+4ML &amp; 8F+4ML</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>Tavern Rd</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125 (Spring St)</td>
<td>Steele Canyon Rd</td>
<td>4F/4C/2C</td>
<td>6F/6F/4F</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54/SR 125</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>6F/4F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4T/4F</td>
<td>8T/8F</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR163</td>
<td>4F/6F/8F</td>
<td>8F &amp; 8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 2 HOV</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML/MB &amp; 8F+4ML</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Mapleview St.</td>
<td>6F/4F</td>
<td>8F/6F</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>8F/6F/4F</td>
<td>8F/6F+2HOV &amp; 6F</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>$0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125A</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94/SR 125</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F/6F</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
<td>$0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 2 ML/ 10F</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>SR-905</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F</td>
<td>$0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St.</td>
<td>Dye Road</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Dr.</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Valley Center Rd</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F</td>
<td>$2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75/SR 282</td>
<td>Glorieta Blvd</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C + 2TU</td>
<td>$4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifecycle Assumptions:**
Highway/Freeway 20 Years

10/18/06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TRANSIT DISTRICT</th>
<th>Total Cost (Inc. User)/PMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Increase in Blue Line Trolley (Red Car)</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Increase in Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Pt. Loma to Mira Mesa via Black Mt &amp; Linda Vista</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa via I-15/I-805</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Escondido to Sorrento Mesa via Mira Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Old Town via I-5 and Pac Highway</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>32nd Street to Sorrento Mesa via I-15/Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>El Cajon to UTC via Hwy 52</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Legoland to UTC via El Camino Real/i-5</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>H Street Trolley to Eastlake via SW College</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Escondido to Centre City/ Airport via I-15/Hwy 94</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Increase in Oceanside to Escondido Rail</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Road</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Old Towne to Balboa Station via Mission Blvd</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Centre City to Otay Mesa via Hwy 95/i-805/Tel Cyn.</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Coronado to Sorrento Mesa via Hillcrest/Genesee</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Mid-Coast</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifecycle Assumptions**

- Rail Cars: 25 Years
- Bus Vehicles: 12 Years
- Stations: 25 Years
- ROW Improvements: 25 Years

*Transit Costs for some projects include Direct Access Ramp (DAR) improvements which are multi-modal