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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- I-15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE
- 2006 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AUGMENTATION

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.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, February 16, 2007

ITEM #  

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 19, 2007, MEETING MINUTES  

RECOMMENDATION  

APPROVE

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 ITEM (3)

+3.  

TRANSIT REVENUE APPORTIONMENTS AND PROJECTIONS  

(Sookyung Kim)  

RECOMMEND

By March 1 of each year, SANDAG provides operating revenue estimates and allocations to the transit operators and to local agencies for the non-motorized program. The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors to approve these estimates and allocations at its February 23, 2007, meeting.

REPORTS (4 through 9)

+4.  

INTERSTATE 15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE  

(Barrow Emerson)  

APPROVE

On October 6, 2006, the Transportation Committee preliminarily endorsed an initial operations plan for the Interstate 15 Bus Rapid Transit (I-15 BRT) services beginning in 2012. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve: (1) an I-15 corridor BRT operations plan for 2012 that includes BRT service to both downtown San Diego and the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD area, with an alignment along Mira Mesa Boulevard for the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD service, and (2) identification of Metropolitan Transit Systems as the operator for the 2012 BRT operations plan.

+5.  

PROPOSED CHANGES TO FasTrak® PROGRAM – TRANSPONDER AND ACCOUNT FEES ASSESSMENT  

(Derek Toups)  

RECOMMEND

At its January 19, 2007, meeting, the Transportation Committee directed staff to consider additional options for introducing new program fees and incentives and a new business model for Interstate 15 FasTrak operations and to report back to the Committee with estimated fee revenue and customer impacts related to the options.
+6. **2006 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AUGMENTATION (José A. Nuncio)**

   Proposition 1B, approved by the voters in the recent November 2006 elections, adds $2 billion to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This report presents and discusses potential projects to program nearly $164 million in regional STIP available through FY 2010-2011.

7. **RURAL HIGHWAY 94 STATUS REPORT (Elisa Arias, SANDAG; Sam Amen, Caltrans)**

   As requested during public comments at the October 27, 2006, Board of Directors meeting, Caltrans staff will provide an oral update on the status of Caltrans plans to improve the Rural Highway 94 Corridor.

+8. **UPDATE ON THE COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AGENCY (Dan Levy, SANDAG; Rob Carley, FACT)**

   SANDAG designated Full Access and Coordinated Transportation (FACT), Inc., as the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency in 2006. This report will summarize the work completed by FACT, and highlight the work that is planned to be completed in the future.

+9. **SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum)**

   This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures. SANDAG staff will summarize recent progress on the project.

10. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

    The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, March 2, 2007, at 9 a.m.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

   + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF JANUARY 19, 2007

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) 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 Deputy Mayor David Druker (North County Coastal) and a second by Vice Chair Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the December 8, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Don Bellamu, a member of the public residing in Boulevard, asked about the availability of vanpools traveling from Imperial to San Diego County. Executive Director Gary Gallegos stated that an interregional program already existed and the majority of vans come from Riverside County. Mr. Gallegos referred Mr. Bellamu to staff member Jack Boda for further follow-up.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) asked if we currently support vans crossing county lines. Mr. Gallegos stated the Transportation Committee and the Board have already adopted a policy that gives limited funds to interregional vanpools; but that the first priority is to vans originating and staying within San Diego County. Mayor Art Madrid (East County) suggested that Mr. Bellamu contact the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), as Imperial Valley is a member of that organization, to determine if funds are available; but Mayor Madrid also suggested this item be referred to the Borders Committee to ensure cooperation between regions.

Sandor Shapery (Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group) stated that he is often contacted by citizens questioning the synchronization of traffic signals within and between adjoining communities and is interested in knowing if improvements could be made for traffic to flow more smoothly. Mr. Gallegos stated that work with the 18 cities is currently underway, and the first phase should be launched beginning the first part of this year.

Deputy Mayor Druker mentioned that the North County Transit District (NCTD) has added buses to Escondido Route 350 due to construction. He believes if signal priorities in the plans were acted on quickly, the need for added buses and the extra operational dollars would be eliminated.
Vice Chair Madaffer welcomed Paul Nieto (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]) as a new member and acknowledged Xema Jacobson (SDRAA) as the alternate. Also mentioned was Deputy Mayor Druker continuing to represent North County Coastal until such time as the Transportation Committee representatives were decided. Vice Chair Madaffer also introduced and welcomed Executive Assistant Lois Meza, Mr. Gallegos’ assistant, as the clerk for the committee.

CONSENT ITEMS

Vice Chair Madaffer noted that Consent Items 3, 5, and 7 were pulled for discussion. Consent Item 11 was pulled and returned to staff. The remaining Consent Items 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12 were approved with one motion.

4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENTS (APPROVE)

In June 2002, the County of San Diego agreed to divest transit operations to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Several open but inactive claims previously under the County Transit System have been identified. MTS has requested that all inactive claims be closed and any remaining funds returned to MTS to use as part of its FY 2008 Capital Improvement Program. On December 14, 2006, MTS approved the close-out of these claims, which total $2,633,467. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Resolution No. 2007-14, closing the claim numbers.

6. GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FY 2008 TRANSIT OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)

The responsibilities for programming transit operating and capital funding reside with SANDAG and its role as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. As in prior years, the Transportation Committee approves guiding principles and objectives for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and NCTD for use in preparing their operating budgets. The proposed guiding principles and objectives have been reviewed by the staff of both transit agencies and reflect their comments and input.

8. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WHITE PAPER: ENERGY (INFORMATION)

A number of white papers are being developed for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This paper discusses Energy Demand and Infrastructure. The information in this report will be used in the development of the 2007 RTP.

9. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WHITE PAPER: INTERREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION (INFORMATION)

Several white papers are being developed for the 2007 RTP. This paper describes current interregional travel patterns, discusses projected growth in interregional trips and implications for interregional travel, and identifies issues and potential solutions for evaluation. The information in this report will be used in the development of the 2007 RTP.
10. CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

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.

12. JANUARY TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES (INFORMATION)

This report will provide an overview of the changes being planned by MTS and NCTD for January 2007 implementation. The January service changes include the final set of changes from the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA).

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Stocks and a second by Mayor Holt Pfeiler, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12, including Resolution No. 2007-14.

11. COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN AD HOC WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

This report provides information about the proposed Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan Ad Hoc Working Group. This working group would oversee the development of this new federally required plan and would aid in best complying with the public involvement requirements outlined by the draft federal guidance.

Action: This item was pulled and returned to staff due to the existence of another committee that could incorporate those members of the proposed committee.

Other items pulled from the Consent Calendar were discussed at this point.

3. APPOINTMENT TO SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (APPROVE)

SANDAG recently established the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) to advise SANDAG on transportation issues for seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of limited means. This action was taken in order to be in compliance with the Public Utilities Code (PUC) by fulfilling the membership, representation, and organization requirements set forth in the code. One of the SSTAC membership positions has been recently vacated. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the appointment of a new member to SSTAC as the representative of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older.

Councilmember Monroe stated that our CTSA contract now is with FACT (Full Accessible Coordinated Transportation) in Oceanside and inquired about whether the actions of FACT and the SSTAC and its members are in tandem.
Councilmember Monroe suggested there may be an overlap between the Subcommittee on Accessible Transit (SCAT) and FACT programs, and questioned whether both committees could be combined. Karen King stated the two committees served different purposes and Danielle Kochman concurred that the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) required both committees to continue.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee approved the appointment of Clive Richards to SSTAC as the representative of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older.

5. **2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: QUARTERLY AMENDMENT NO. 2 (APPROVE)**

At its meeting on August 4, 2006, the SANDAG Board adopted the 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2007 to FY 2011. The Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration approved the 2006 RTIP on October 4, 2006. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis based on requests from member agencies.

Jose Lopez, a member of the public representing the Fox Canyon Neighborhood Association, requested that the Fox Canyon project (SD138) be retained on the 2006 RTIP list. Since 1997, this community has been working on a much-needed connecting road that provides a secondary emergency entrance and exit into its neighborhoods. Mr. Gallegos stated this project was pulled from the TransNet list at the request of City of San Diego due to its being a local city project. Vice Chair Madaffer explained its being removed from the list was due to the termination of another project in the area; however, he believed that in another six months the city will once again add this project to the TransNet list along with the larger project and other potential development in the area. Vice Chair Madaffer encouraged Mr. Lopez to stay active in the pursuit of this project, and to participate in the city budget discussions when the TransNet list is being contemplated between April and May of this year.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Holt Pfeiler and a second by Deputy Mayor Stocks, the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2007-15 and approved Amendment No. 2 to the 2006 RTIP.

7. **2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WHITE PAPER: EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES IN TRANSPORTATION (INFORMATION)**

Technological advances are keys to achieving our regional mobility goals. Vehicle Infrastructure Integration (VII) is a set of applications and emerging technologies that create a wireless internet for vehicles and roadside transportation. VII applications include elements of the Automated Highway System and Intelligent Vehicle technologies, which were demonstrated in the San Diego region starting in the 1990s. The white paper evaluates these major trends and technologies as possible contributors to the region’s long-range transportation goals over the next 30 years and beyond. Major technologies were discussed,
including issues, policy implications and recommendation for the 2007 RTP, and future analysis. The information in this report will be used in the development of the 2007 RTP.

Deputy Mayor Druker commented that as we look toward emerging technologies (monorails and people movers) we should remain mindful of the fact that we have chosen specific technologies such as the Coaster which runs on both the Sprinter and Trolley tracks specifically for two reasons – maintenance and interchangeability. However, we still should consider new transportation ideas such as gondolas running from the valleys to the mesas in the Sorrento Valley area, specifically between Sorrento Valley Road and Sorrento Valley Boulevard, in order for area employees to get to the train station, thereby alleviating much traffic congestion.

Mr. Shapery commented that he has been a proponent of pushing advancements in technologies and that even though it’s prudent to utilize existing infrastructures, we should not rule out all other technologies unless we look at the total financial analysis. He’s an advocate of Maglev and other electrified rail technologies, and the best way to utilize these emerging technologies and to make them successful is to fit them into the existing infrastructures rather than having to develop entirely new infrastructures.

Linda Culp, Senior Planner, remarked on the capacity systems comments made earlier and said that it would be a good idea to prudently monitor new technology ideas, especially the Phase 2 Maglev Study future analysis as we continue to update RTPs.

Sam Johnson, Integrated Information Systems Manager, noted that with regards to VII, staff was monitoring the actions of the U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT) and whether they have adopted it as one of their nine major initiatives. As we develop our new Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan, we will be looking at it and returning to the committee to provide information.

Mr. Gallegos noted that US DOT is in the process of developing urban partnerships with the federal government, and they will be allocating approximately $250 million and focusing on a few major areas. During a recent legislature hearing, Assistant Secretary Duvall highlighted that San Diego, Los Angeles and San Francisco were prime candidates for one of these urban partnerships. If San Diego was successful in being selected, it would bring money to advance some of the ITS work the Board has already approved in the RTP.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
13. INFRASTRUCTURE BOND FUNDING: STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND STATE LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Jose Nuncio, Senior Engineer/Financial Programming, stated that Proposition 1B approved by the voters in November will add nearly $20 billion to various transportation programs. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has requested the regions to submit programming proposals for the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation and the newly created State & Local Partnership Program (SLPP). This report described the development criteria and timeline program for submittal to the Transportation Committee and the Board. The Transportation Committee has been requested to recommend that Caltrans include seven interregional STIP rail projects (listed below) in its statewide list for programming. Additionally, the Transportation Committee has been requested to approve the release of $146,908 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to Caltrans over two and one half years for reimbursable positions required to implement the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Delegation Pilot Program.

The deadline to submit projects for the 2006 STIP Augmentation is April 2, 2007. The CTC will adopt the 2006 STIP Augmentation at its June 7, 2007 meeting. In order to comply with the CTC’s schedule and also provide opportunity to the Transportation Committee and the Board to provide feedback, staff proposed the following schedule: February 16, 2007 – STIP and SLPP Recommendations to Transportation Committee; March 2, 2007 – STIP and SLPP Recommendation to Transportation Committee (if needed); and March 23, 2007 – STIP and SLPP Recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Deputy Mayor Druker stated the NCTD Board has not looked at these recommendations nor approved them, and that the priorities we send to Caltrans should include maintenance and safety. Therefore, he believed we should move No. 6 Sorrento-Miramar Phase 1 and No. 5 NCTD Timber Bridge to the top of the list as Nos. 2 and 3, respectively.

Mr. Gallegos mentioned that we must keep in mind there is $45 million available statewide and that by moving our priorities we may not be competing as well. The current list is consistent with the action recently taken by the NCTD Board, and discussions recently occurred regarding STIP and RTP programming during the 2006 STIP.

NCTD Executive Director Karen King mentioned prioritizing was difficult, but for this particular submission all factors were considered.

Caltrans District 11 Director Pedro Orso-Delgado reminded the Committee there would be future opportunities to fund various projects, and that we are currently developing the Goods Movement Action Plan and some of these projects could be contained within its criteria.

Deputy Mayor Stocks stated the proposals were consistent with the NCTD goals.

MTS Chair Pro Tem Robert Emery inquired as to the actual process for developing the project list. Mr. Nuncio stated that the guiding principles have been both project readiness and how it supports the TransNet program.
Mr. Gallegos mentioned that 15 percent of funds are available for non-Early Action projects, and that NCTD and MTS should do their best to prioritize their lists of potential STIP-eligible transit projects.

Mayor Madrid reminded the Committee that the priorities are set to ensure our region has the best opportunity for the funding on a statewide competitive basis.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Stocks and a second by MTS Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee directed staff to prepare STIP funding proposals that meet the guidelines of the STIP and SLPP programs established by the CTC, and that maximize and leverage the use of TransNet and other regional funds. The Transportation Committee also recommended that Caltrans include the following interregional STIP rail projects in its statewide list for programming.

1. Encinitas Grade Separated Pedestrian Crossing, construction: $1.248 million
2. Double Track North Coast Rail Corridor in Carlsbad, construction: $18 million
3. Double Track North Coast Rail Corridor in Oceanside, preliminary engineering and environmental: $2 million
4. Miramar Hill Realignment, preliminary engineering and options assessment: $1 million
5. North County Transit District (NCTD) Timber Bridge Replacement Program: $50 million
6. Sorrento-Miramar Phase 1, construction: $35 million
7. Double Track North Coast Rail Corridor between Cardiff and Solana Beach Passing Track, preliminary engineering and environmental: $2.5 million

Lastly, the Transportation Committee approved the release of $146,908 in RSTP funds to Caltrans over a time period not to exceed two and one half years for implementation of the NEPA Delegation Pilot Program.

14. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO FasTrak® PROGRAM – TRANSPONDER AND ACCOUNT FEES ASSESSMENT (RECOMMEND)**

Vice Chair Madaffer prefaced the staff report by stating he was the only “no” vote on this issue at the Transportation Committee meeting in October. Staff then went before the Board and the staff recommendation was rejected. The Board directed staff to report back to the Transportation Committee with a report on the FasTrak program that addressed a number of issues including: an analysis of its business and operational costs, benchmarks of the program against other tolling facilities around the state, and identifying incentives for commuters to use the program. Finally, the Board requested that staff develop additional program options for consideration that would address some of the operational issues.

Vice Chair Madaffer congratulated staff for its considerable progress since its last appearance before the Transportation Committee in October.

Derek Toups, Associate Planner, reported that at its October 27, 2006, meeting, the Board of Directors instructed staff to evaluate the Interstate 15 (I-15) FasTrak program fee structure and report back to the Transportation Committee on alternative funding strategies. Staff has
evaluated the FasTrak program policies, fees, and associated program costs, and has completed a peer assessment of other FasTrak toll operators and priced high-occupancy-toll (HOT) lane facilities. The proposed options include: Option A - $1 per month transponder lease fee plus $1.50 per month account maintenance fee with a $3 incentive plan; Option B (staff-recommended) - $1 per month transponder lease fee plus $2.50 per month account maintenance fee with a $5 incentive plan; and Option C - $5 per month account maintenance fee, inclusive of transponder fee, with a $5 incentive fee. In addition to selecting one of the three options, the Transportation Committee also was asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board that it authorize staff to negotiate a funding agreement with MTS for continued funding of transit operations in the I-15 corridor using surplus toll revenue that would result from the assessment of the proposed transponder and/or account fees.

A discussion by the Committee ensued regarding the different toll/deposit practices of the other regions.

Mr. Shapery mentioned possessing several Orange County transponders and paying a $30 deposit fee for each. He was curious as to why we had not picked up on this revenue-source practice. He stated that these deposits were held in a noninterest bearing account and with approximately 175,000 users, the fee per transponder would equate to $5 million in additional revenue, which when invested at 5 percent adds up to an additional $250,000.

Mr. Toups responded by saying that all toll agencies handling credit cards take a pre-authorization charge and a $40 deposit per transponder is charged to all cash and check paying customers, which represents less than 2 percent of our total customer base. He also believed that the other toll agencies were not actually holding any money for those credit card accounts but that they were doing so for cash and check customers.

Mr. Shapery stated that a constant $30 account balance was maintained and that they reduced it every time he went on the toll and then they hit the credit card and raised it back up again; so, in fact, the $30 is taken off at the beginning and maintained by the toll agency indefinitely.

Mr. Toups stated that we use a similar replenishment method as do other agencies and that we charge the credit card $40 when a user gets below a certain balance (for us it is $10), and then we automatically replenish the card. We do that to minimize the number of times we charge the credit card to reduce credit card fees. We also have the option of putting these dollars into an interest-bearing account; however, our financial department has determined the amount of interest we would be receiving was less than the amount of fees we would be paying to manage the account, thereby offsetting each other. As we continue to grow we will look at putting the money into more aggressive interest-bearing accounts.

Mayor Madrid inquired as to whom Mr. Shapery should continue to keep his account with - Orange County or San Diego. Mr. Toups stated that decision would be determined by the action taken today.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked for the total annual revenue. Mr. Toups responded that projected revenue for the current fiscal year was $1.2 million and that the all-time maximum revenue of $2.4 million was collected in FY 2003.
MTS Chair Pro Tem Emery asked about the status of renegotiations of the MTS service provided on I-15 and of the income projections being considerably less than in previous years. He also inquired about the long-range ramifications for MTS and what we expect to provide with only half the revenue expected from FasTrak. MTS has been budgeting about $1 million in FasTrak revenue and with current projections that will all go away because our own expenses will exceed revenue. The $1 million provides the entire subsidy for all of the high-profile express routes such as the 810 from Escondido, the 820 from Poway, the 850 from Rancho Penasquitos, and the 860 from Rancho Bernardo. If the whole corridor (including frequently-serviced Route 20) is considered, then it accounts for 25 percent of the entire subsidy in the I-15 corridor. This issue is of particular interest to MTS because it recently signed a new contract for 26 new express buses for delivery sometime in June. The FasTrak subsidy goes toward funding this service. The MTS will need to deal with the issue if it occurs. One million dollars of subsidy has been programmed into I-15 service planning. The moneys allocated for the I-15 BRT service are not what we probably need for the services desired and it most likely will put a further substantial dent in those services.

Mr. Gallegos added that we consider this a short-term issue until the entire managed lanes are open and the customer base will increase because we now are attracting customers all the way from Escondido to San Diego. We should start opening pieces of that in 2007 - 2008, and the whole stretch opening in 2012. Secondly, according to law that guides this, the first key is to manage the facility so that it always operates on a high level of service and any excess revenues were to enhance transit service. FasTrak legislation never intended this would be the sole funding source for the transit service but was to enhance what we could do and use as a management tool. It was not meant to maximize revenue but to maximize the facility. Excess revenue would go toward transit. But before we can even get to that we have to pay for enforcement, i.e. pay the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for enforcement (whose costs are going up faster than inflation). As we open the new facility and as revenues increase we also have to pay for some of the enhanced maintenance costs that Caltrans would experience. It further emphasizes that we have many questions to answer as we get closer to the BRT and to the full implementation of the I-15.

Deputy Mayor Stocks commented that SANDAG is getting worked by the Orange and Riverside accounts. We are giving away for free what others are charging a fee or deposit for. We need to look at our business model and that action needs to be taken as word gets out that we are handing out $30 transponders for free and monitoring their accounts, mailing marketing items, and not charging them anything for any of that service. Therefore, establishing some type of fee is advantageous. Now the decision is how much per month and how much do we credit, etc. The dollar-for-dollar reduction model/offset seems a desirable option that does not appear in any of the three options provided by staff.

Chief Economist Marney Cox responded by stating that we have fixed costs and that each account incurs that cost of approximately $3.50.

Jack Boda, Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation, stated that very shortly we will be going into the second generation of the FasTrak system, and we have a very intricate algorithm that will look at these types of incentives and billing. We want to take a look at incentive as we start to have more people use the FasTrak system. We may be able to work into the algorithm, with Board approval, some credit back for using the system for a car-pool type situation. We have a very outdated algorithm we are working with and
we don’t own it. The program is owned by Transcore and we’d rather have our own. In the next year you’ll see some proposals back which will make us look more futuristic. SR 125 will be opening and we will have many people in the South Bay that will want to get in on the SANDAG deal to get around the transponder fees. So we want parity first and foremost; then we will look at creative ways in the next penetrations to do the things we are discussing.

Mr. Boda continued that a month ago, staff said they would come back very quickly within this coming year with a new plan. Currently, the I-15 facility has one entrance and one exit point so you’re on it for the eight miles. On the new facility we will be able to get on and off at various points. The direction this Committee and the Board has given us is to look at a per-mile transaction fee so that the complexity of the transactions on I-15 will go up tremendously because of short and long length, and we need to modernize the system.

Deputy Mayor Stocks asked if we have the technology to do a current dollar-for-dollar offset. Mr. Cox stated the concern is if we start charging the $3.50 minimum cost that many of the inactive accounts would drop off and then the remaining active accounts even though charged $3.50 would be challenged to offset our basic average operational costs.

Vice Chair Madaffer stated he was surprised that other FasTrak facilities around the state charge these costs and in San Diego we haven’t and that is not good business. Our goal should be to increase the use of our managed lanes through incentives. As the new system opens up it will be the most unique managed lanes set-up in the state and we obviously have to be ready for it and staff guarantees us they will be.

Further discussion regarding available options A, B, and C emphasized the concern, from a parity standpoint, that Option C may make better sense because it is more consistent with what South Bay is going to be doing.

Councilmember Monroe believes the $5 fee with a dollar-for-dollar offset is most desirable.

Mr. Cox stated that if we have 10,000 inactive users which are costing and not contributing and a considerable percentage drop off when the $5 fee is enacted then staff would need to return with a new calculation as to what the basic average cost would be.

Mayor Madrid remarked that Mr. Boda’s earlier statement regarding a significant change taking place in the not-so-distant future and that we do not make a change now and then again. If we could have the new system done shortly it would behoove us to wait. Mr. Boda said the next generation would occur in 2008 and would take into account variable pricing. A concern is making two major changes within a short time frame. We’ll be criticized significantly for being typical bureaucrats. If it makes economic sense to stay as we are as we’re making these changes and make just one change that would be preferable.

Mr. Nieto found the presentation illuminating. Option B is too complicated. Option B would be so different from South Bay that it would create confusion in our region. He liked the idea of a $5 minimum with a dollar-for-dollar offset of usage. From a consumer standpoint this appears easier to understand.
Board of Supervisors Chairman Ron Roberts asked if the transponder cost was included in the $3.50 operational costs. Mr. Toups stated the transponder cost was above and beyond and that the combined cost per customer was $5 per month.

Supervisor Roberts stated he believed we neglected to include a very important part of the cost of doing business. He also stated his dismay in our not investing the money being held because the management fee was higher than the return. Renee Wasmund, Director of Finance, stated that the cash comes into our operator, Transcore, who has expenses to pay out, so it’s a cash flow issue.

Vice Chair Madaffer stated that staff should come back with the actual cash flow model to better understand exactly how the money is flowing.

At its conclusion, it was determined that staff should return to the next Transportation Committee Meeting with additional information.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mr. Nieto and a second by Deputy Mayor Stocks, the Transportation Committee recommended that staff return to the next Transportation Committee meeting with additional information about possible scenarios for account management and transponder fees.

15. FY 2008 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS PROPOSALS (RECOMMEND)

In October 2006, the Transportation Committee approved the criteria for selecting projects for consideration in the FY 2008 federal transportation appropriations process. Staff has worked with Caltrans, the transit agencies, and local jurisdictions to develop the priorities for the FY 2008 funding cycle.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Madaffer and a second by Deputy Mayor Stocks, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve the list of proposed project funding requests for the FY 2008 federal transportation appropriations cycle.

16. BUDGET TRANSFER FOR EMERGENCY REPAIRS (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with MTS for fund transfers from MTS to SANDAG to fund emergency repairs to the MTS Blue Line tracks in an amount not to exceed $350,000, and approve use of change orders to the SANDAG Rail Replacement Broadway Project to rehabilitate track at two grade crossings on the MTS Blue Line as an emergency procurement of construction services through an existing construction contract.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chairman Roberts and a second by MTS Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee authorized the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with MTS for fund transfers from MTS to SANDAG to fund emergency repairs to the MTS Blue Line tracks in an amount not to exceed $350,000, and approved use of change orders to the SANDAG Rail Replacement Broadway Project to rehabilitate track at two grade crossings on the MTS Blue Line as an emergency procurement of construction services through an existing construction contract.
17. FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR FY 2006 JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE AND NEW FREEDOM PROJECTS (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors the list of Job Access and Reverse Commute and New Freedom Projects be approved for funding.

Jay Powell, a member of the community, mentioned his strong support and appreciation for including Route 960; a commuter that goes through mid-city and currently serves people trying to get to work from City Heights and the mid-city area. He also hopes that we can expand the line as well.

Councilmember Monroe asked for clarification on the FACT money. Dan Levy, Senior Planner, stated it was 50 percent; the mobility management was 80 percent and the NCTD for travel training was 50 percent at a 20 percent match. This money is in addition to the contract that we have with FACT to be our CTSA. It is new money and the 20 percent match that FACT needs to put up can be from any source including in-kind. There will be a briefing to the Transportation Committee on FACT at the February 16 meeting.

Supervisor Roberts asked if all New Freedom projects required a 20 percent match. Mr. Levy responded that the first four were operating at a 50 percent match and that mobility management was planning on a 20 percent match.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked about there being different rules in FY 2007 and requested insight into what that might mean. Mr. Levy said that in 2007 any project must be included in the Coordinated Transportation Plan, which we are currently putting together. The final guidance on how to do that has still not been released by the federal government. They allowed us to run a competitive process this year without that coordinated plan so that the projects this year were not in a previous plan for New Freedom. For JARC, they were projects that were in the Welfare to Work study done previously.

Mayor Madrid asked about the funding being for a single year only with no commitment for future years and if we anticipate any kind of incentive or criteria that would continue funding for successful programs. Mr. Levy stated that the funding could be renewed but that there is no commitment. When the coordinated plan is done we will look at what ends up being operated. All the projects are in areas where there are service gaps and deficiencies and those are the kinds of things that we'll look at funding under the coordinated plan.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by MTS Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee recommended to the SANDAG Board of Directors that the list of Jobs Access and Reverse Commute and New Freedom Projects provided in Tables 1 and 2 of the staff report be approved for funding.

18. SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (INFORMATION)

Jim Linthicum, Division Director of Engineering and Construction, provided a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, and stated that the most significant event was NCTD’s Amended Recovery Plan gaining acceptance by FTA on December 8, 2006, and that there
should be no further holds on the federal money. The SPRINTER project construction continues
to advance toward completion. The new and vacant positions on the project team have been
filled. Nineteen of 32 miles of track have been placed and the DMU brake testing has begun.
No problems have been identified to date. Overall, the four contracts are 73 percent complete
at the end of December compared to 70 percent the previous month. All the major civil work
should be completed by March, with the exception of the stations, which will be completed by
fall. The systems work such as signaling and communication is critical which includes start-up
work i.e., pre-revenue training and testing of the system.

The critical path for all of these items shows revenue operations being completed in February
2008 compared to last month’s report which was January 2008; therefore an area of concern.
That is being mitigated on two fronts by adding more crews to their systems efforts and also by
having the general contractor open up more areas for the systems subcontractors to work. This
delay can also be mitigated as mentioned in past reports by having NCTD and its contract
operator perform more of the start-up activities concurrent with the actual construction work.
Mr. Linthicum has attended meetings in the past month where they are brainstorming ways to
do that. Therefore, given all the above, a December 2007 start of revenue operations is still
very achievable.

The estimate to complete the construction increased by $2 million over the past month to
$447 million. Three major reasons include: (1) fine tuning mainline cost; (2) moving
environmental work from operations to capital; and (3) more conservative formula to calculate
the contingency reserved for quantity overruns. The largest pending change order is the repair
of the landslide at Rancho del Oro which is approximately $2 million, and when the work is
completed in the next few months it will increase the change order percentage. A concern is
keeping the project on schedule. The contractor is taking all the right steps to mitigate the
delays in the system work but he needs to be more aggressive and creative to keep the project
on a December 2007 revenue operations date. The mainline contractor believes he has
additional direct and overhead costs due to the number of design changes on the contract. The
contractor has submitted a portion of its costs and NCTD is reviewing those costs. The
contractor is expected to submit the remainder of its costs over the next few months.

Councilmember Monroe mentioned that at the last report there were issues with some of the
cities not processing things as quickly as required. Mr. Linthicum said some of the initial
concerns were in eastern San Marcos and Escondido where initial trains are being tested and
that is less of a concern. However, as the train testing proceeds to the west to Oceanside, we
will need to work with each city to resolve their concerns.

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

19. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN NETWORK DEVELOPMENT: UNCONSTRAINED
HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT NETWORKS (INFORMATION)

Principal Planners Mike Hix and Dave Schumacher presented a progress report on the 2007 RTP
and the development of the unconstrained highway and transit networks. The Unconstrained
Network is not limited by revenues and establishes the long-range vision for the highway
facilities and the transit service to meet the region’s travel demand in the year 2030. The RTP
was coordinated with Caltrans, MTS, NCTD, and other agencies and local jurisdictions. The
network reflects the extensive transit plan review that will set the stage to create revenue
scenarios. The transit strategy includes developing a network of urban core routes with
10-minute, all-day service and arterial rapid bus networks and suburban services geared to demand. Refinements to the 2003 RTP Unconstrained Transit Network included the development of a high-frequency local bus/rapid bus network in urban core areas, and a shift from BRT in arterial corridors to rapid bus services. Other key components of the 2007 Unconstrained Transit Network include transit arterial priority to capital improvements needed for high-speed and reliable services, including a multimodal managed lanes strategy with BRT priority and in-line stations. Also critical are the continued rehabilitation and expansion of the rail network as well as the implementation of Smart Growth principles supporting transit.

The Unconstrained Highway Network changes, additions, and deletions from the last RTP were presented as were the corridors that continue to experience high levels of congestion. The next steps include refining cost estimates of the projects and then, by using the Board-adopted evaluation criteria, rank all projects that then can be discussed at the upcoming Board Retreat; upon which we can create the revenue constrained and reasonably expected scenarios. Staff will be bringing these projects back to this Committee for discussion at the March 2 meeting.

Jay Powell, representing the City Heights Community Development Corporation, spoke about the impact of the RTP on the centerline and the mid-city BRT system. The plan does emphasize a strategy that includes inline stations and Smart Growth which are important aspects; however, it does not address a strategy that feeds the centerline and that gets people to and from job centers in all directions.

Duncan McFetridge and Jana Clark, representing Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR), presented information about the importance of speaking the truth regarding transportation and what it means to the community, the globe, and the nation. They expressed concern over the unconstrained transit portion of the plan never getting funds nor being completed; and the constrained roadway portion of the plan getting the funds and being completed. They then presented data regarding the current mode split being 2 percent transit during peak periods rather than the 5 percent reported in Mobility 2030. The 10 percent target of the region does not seem achievable without major changes in policy. Also mentioned was the high cost of cars with regard to accidents, loss of time, global warming, disincentives for independent alternative fuel programs, etc.

MTS Chair Pro Tem Emery, speaking as a North County resident, remarked on the rapid growth of Ramona and the high levels of congested traffic in and out of the community, especially in the downtown area where SR 67 and 78 intersect. He recommended that we look ahead to 2030 that identify this growing problem as it impacts the entire region. Mike Hix commented that road widening on 67 and 78 is being addressed.

Deputy Mayor Druker would like to see further widening of I-5 north of SR 78 in anticipation of a potential relocation of the Chargers stadium. He would like to pursue discussions about possible scenarios with light rail around the region particularly from Riverside down the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and the Lindbergh International Airport, as well as light rail along Palomar Airport Road and SR 76, and around the centerline area. He believes we need to present a vision to the public and let the voters decide.

Mayor Madrid requested a separate meeting to further discuss this issue.

Vice Chair Madaffer stated that more discussion would be taking place at the Board Retreat.
Kathy Keehan, advisory member with the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, would like clarification regarding which bus projects on the RTP list are being cancelled or allowed to remain. She also addressed the issue of increased traffic on SR 78 east of I-15 as a result of the casino patronage, and inquired how we should allocate resources for this matter. On a personal note, Kathy would like to see a map of all the underserved transit areas where service is more than a distance of one-half mile away.

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

20. **UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 16, 2007.

21. **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 11:34 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>David Druker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Bob Campbell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ben Hueso</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Nieto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor's Appointee</td>
<td>Xema Jacobson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandor Shapery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Nordstrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Keehan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The transit operators within the SANDAG region receive various federal, state, and local revenues to support both ongoing operations and capital projects. While Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds (Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula and Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization [Rail Mod] programs) comprise the main funding source for capital improvements, these federal formula funds are also used for operating purposes (i.e., for activities qualifying as “preventive maintenance” including maintenance of vehicles, equipment, and facilities).

State and local revenues provide funding for continued operations of transit services as well as match for federal capital funds. SANDAG is responsible for the apportionment of these funds to the transit operators and to the local agencies for the non-motorized program. This report provides the apportionments for FY 2008 and projection of revenues for FY 2009 to FY 2012 for each fund type.

For FY 2008, the San Diego County Auditor provided the estimate of regional Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues. The State Controller’s office provided the FY 2008 estimates for the State Transit Assistance (STA). The TransNet estimates are based on actual sales tax receipts through December 2006 for the program escalated by growth projected in the region’s Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM). The FTA Section 5307 and Section 5309 appropriations have been delayed due to budgeting issues at the federal level. Therefore, staff relied on the authorized levels identified in Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Staff will update the transit agencies if new information becomes available and will update the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors for the final claim.

The FY 2009 to FY 2012 estimates of TDA and TransNet reflect a modest increase of 3 percent on the low end to a growth from 5.8 to 6.7 percent on the high range based on DEFM. The escalation factor for the STA program is based on the California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved 2006 Fund Estimate. For the federal formula funds, the annual increase is based on SAFETEA-LU. The FY 2008 apportionments and future projections are shown in Attachments 1 through 5.
Discussion

Each year, as the transit agencies undertake their budget development processes, SANDAG provides the estimates of regional transit funding under TDA, STA, the two FTA formula programs (Section 5307 and 5309 Rail Mod), and TransNet sales tax. The allocation of some of these funding sources such as STA and TransNet is determined entirely by law, but the allocation of the federal funds and, to a limited extent, the TDA funds, is determined at the discretion of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

At the direction of the Transportation Committee last February, the Transit Revenue Methodology Working Group (representing the management of NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG) convened to review the allocation methodologies for the FTA funds (including not previously mentioned Section 5311 rural funds as well as the above-mentioned formula funds) and the TDA funds. The working group, which included senior management members, met throughout the past summer and presented their findings to executive management who ratified the allocation methodologies used for the proposed allocations presented in Attachments 1 and 5 and described below.

Transportation Development Act (TDA)

The TDA is the major subsidy source that supports the region’s public transit operators and non-motorized transportation projects. The TDA comes from 1/4 percent of state sales tax assessed in the region. SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the apportionment of TDA funds each year in conformance with legislative priorities. The transit operators and other member agencies submit their annual TDA claims based on these apportionments and in compliance with SANDAG’s TDA Administration Policy (approved by the SANDAG Board on February 24, 2004).

The County Auditor estimates that $134 million of TDA funds will be available for FY 2008. This equates to a 4.9 percent increase from the FY 2007 apportionment. The apportionment for FY 2008 determines the amount of funds available to each agency to claim. SANDAG is required to notify prospective claimants of the apportionments by March 1, necessitating action by the Board this month.

The legislative priorities established by state law include certain categories for which TDA funds are taken “off the top.” These include the allocation to SANDAG for various planning, programming, and administrative-related expenses, funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and support of community transit services. In addition, the County Auditor receives an allocation based on estimates of its costs to administer the TDA program. The remaining apportionment along with prior year carryover funds are available to be claimed by NCTD and MTS. The balance of current year funds are apportioned based upon the respective population of two transit service areas. Prior year carryover funds are those apportionments that have not yet been claimed by the operators, and they remain available to the operator for which they were originally apportioned.

Part of the apportionment of the TDA funds included the set aside of “up to” 10 percent of MTS’ share for planning purposes. The 10 percent set aside segregated a portion of the MTS population share of TDA funds to cover the cost of the planning and development functions formerly performed by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board. Since most of the planning and development functions are now performed by SANDAG, staff recommends that 10 percent of MTS’ population share no longer be segregated. MTS concurred with this recommendation.
Pursuant to provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 1703 and agreed to between SANDAG and the two transit agencies, regional transit capital projects are implemented by SANDAG with funding transferred from both MTS and NCTD. Accordingly, TDA apportionments reflect the transfer of local match for the federal formula funds for the capital projects transitioned to SANDAG. An additional apportionment to SANDAG covers those indirect administrative functions that are not directly funded by projects. The calculation for the cost of these administrative functions was memorialized in Addenda Nos. 3 and 4 to the Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and MTS and NCTD (approved by the Board at its November 18 and December 16, 2005, meetings). Table 1 (Attachment 1) shows the breakdown of revenues available for each agency. For information and comparison purposes, the apportionment for FY 2007 is included in this table alongside the apportionment for FY 2008 and projections for FY 2009 to FY 2012. The FY 2009 to FY 2012 estimates reflect a fixed increase of 3 percent on the low end to a 5.8 to 6.7 percent growth rate on the high end based on DEFM.

**State Transit Assistance (STA)**

The STA program (SB 620, as amended) is derived from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) and provides a second source of operating and capital funding for transit operators. Half of the funds in the PTA support state programs including the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The remaining PTA balance goes to the STA program. Within STA, 25 percent is allocated to regional entities according to a population formula, and an additional 25 percent is allocated to regional entities to be allocated in turn to individual operators proportionately based on a revenue formula. The STA also outlines specific requirements and eligibilities that each transit operator must meet in order to receive STA funds. The State Controller is required to issue estimates of STA funds to be allocated to each regional entity by January 10 of each year. The FY 2008 estimate includes additional funds authorized under Proposition 1B bond act totaling $8.6 million for NCTD and $27.3 million for MTS. At the December 2006 meeting, the Board approved to program the additional bond funds toward the Sprinter project for NCTD and the MTS TransNet Early Action Projects.

Table 2 (Attachment 2) shows the apportionment for FY 2008 and the projected revenues from FY 2009 to FY 2012. The estimated revenues for FY 2009 to FY 2012 are based on the 2006 STIP Fund Estimate. The FY 2009 to FY 2012 estimates are not anticipated to change until the new 2008 Fund Estimate is adopted in August 2007.

**TransNet**

The half-cent sales tax, approved by the voters of San Diego County in 1987, provides funding for major transportation projects in the region. The funding is distributed in equal thirds among highway, transit, and local street and road projects. The one-third of TransNet sales tax revenues dedicated for transit purposes is allocated by population to MTS and NCTD.

By vote of the SANDAG Board of Directors in June 2003, the maximum available for non-rail capital purposes, such as transit operations or bus rapid transit construction (formerly limited to 20 percent of the total transit share of TransNet annual revenues) was increased to 40 percent. Hence, no less than 60 percent of the annual TransNet revenues must be used for specific rail-related capital improvements. Using the actual sales tax receipts to date, the estimated FY 2007 TransNet revenues for transit is $84.6 million, a 5.8 percent increase from FY 2006. The FY 2008 estimate of
$90.3 million is consistent with the DEFM model. The FY 2009 to FY 2012 estimates reflect a fixed increase of 3 percent on the low end to a 5.8 to 6.7 percent growth rate on the high end based on DEFM.

The TransNet program was extended to 2048 by the voters in November 2004. The distribution of revenue under the extension of TransNet differs from the original measure. After deducting costs associated with administration, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), and the bicycle/pedestrian program, beginning in FY 2009 the TransNet program is divided into Major Corridor Projects (42.4 percent), New Bus Rapid Transit/Rail Operations (8.1 percent), Local System Improvements (33 percent), and Transit System Improvements (16.5 percent) from which the transit revenues are derived. Within the transit share, services provided pursuant to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and subsidies for seniors have specific earmarks (2.5 percent and 3.25 percent, respectively). The remaining revenues can be used for operating or miscellaneous capital purposes.

Since the division of revenue differs between the original TransNet measure and the TransNet extension, the allocation of those revenues for transit purposes differs as well. Table 3 (Attachment 3), showing the distribution for the final year of the original measure (FY 2008), starts with the entire one-third of the TransNet revenue for transit and breaks this amount down by operator and by capital versus operations purposes. Table 3a (Attachment 4) provides the revenue based on transit’s 16.5 percent share of the TransNet extension. After deducting for ADA and senior service, the balance is divided between the two transit agencies.

**Federal Transit Administration Programs (Sections 5307 & 5309)**

49 USC Section 5307 provides for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas and for transportation-related planning. For areas with populations of 200,000 and more such as San Diego County, the formula is based on a combination of bus/vanpool revenue vehicle miles, bus/vanpool passenger miles, fixed guideway revenue vehicle miles, and fixed guideway route miles as well as population and population density. Eligible activities under this program include planning, engineering design, and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities; construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. All preventive maintenance and some ADA complementary paratransit service, while recorded as operating expenditures, are considered capital costs for purposes of eligibility.

Capital projects to modernize or improve fixed guideway systems are eligible for funding under the 49 USC Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization program. Projects include, but are not limited to, the purchase and rehabilitation of rolling stock, track, line equipment, and structures, signals and communications, power equipment and substations, passenger stations and terminals, security equipment and systems, maintenance facilities and equipment, operational support equipment (including computer hardware and software), and system extensions. Preventive maintenance also is an eligible cost.

After deducting for the SANDAG Regional Vanpool Program and regional planning (both of which are assumed to grow with growth in the total FTA formula program), Section 5307 funds are allocated 70 percent for MTS and 30 percent for NCTD. The same formula was used to allocate the
Section 5309 Rail Mod funds. (SANDAG does not directly receive funds from the Rail Mod program). These revenues also were used to develop the FY 2008 Transit Capital Improvement Program (CIP) which is scheduled for Transportation Committee review and Board approval in March 2007. The CIP identifies the division of capital projects to be implemented either by MTS, NCTD, or SANDAG. For FY 2008, rather than transferring federal funds to SANDAG to implement the regional projects, MTS plans to transfer prior year TDA and STA funds. These funds total $5.4 million in TDA and $5.3 million in STA.

The Transit Revenue Methodologies Working Group reviewed the above local formula methodology and compared it to the more complicated federal formula methodologies for these two funding programs and determined that there would be no benefit to change. Since the federal formula funds rely on service statistics, it was agreed that the allocation of these funds would be revisited when there is a new federal authorization and whenever there is a major change in service at either agency that could impact the amount of funds coming to the region.

Table 4 (Attachment 5) shows the federal formula program appropriations for FY 2008 and projections for FY 2009 to FY 2012. FY 2009 to FY 2010 are based on SAFETEA-LU, FY 2011 to FY 2012 growth is at 4 percent, which is the average growth over the SAFETEA-LU period.

The allocation of FTA Section 5311 Rural Formula funds has not been part of this transit revenue apportionment process in the past, because NCTD was the sole recipient. However, since MTS is now providing rural service and since the amount of Section 5311 rural formula funds coming to the region more than doubled with the passage of SAFETEA-LU, the working group and senior management agreed that these funds would be distributed proportionate to the rural population in each agency’s service area (59 percent to NCTD, 41 percent to MTS). The state administers these funds, and Caltrans required that SANDAG submit its plan for use of the Section 5311 funds no later than January 31, 2007. As a result, the apportionment of these funds for FY 2008 was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors as a separate action in January. A five-year projection of Section 5311 revenues is not included because relevant information is not available from Caltrans. Staff will work with Caltrans during the coming year to develop future year projections and add them to the transit revenue apportionments and projections coming next year.

RENEE WASMUND
Director of Finance
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4. Table 3a – TransNet Transit Projections FY 2009 to FY 2012
5. Table 4 – Federal Transit Administration (FTA) FY 2008 Apportionment and FY 2009 to FY 2012 Projections
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## Table 1
Transportation Development Act FY 2008 Apportionment and FY 2009 to FY 2012 Projections (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Apportionment</td>
<td>$128,541</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>$142,987</td>
<td>$138,020</td>
<td>$138,020</td>
<td>$142,161</td>
<td>$150,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FY 2008 Apportionment based on the County Auditor. The estimates for FY 2009 to FY 2012 are based on growth rate in retail sales as forecasted by the SANDAG Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM) and excludes interest and prior year excess funds. DEFM serves as the 'high' revenue scenario (between 5.8% to 6.7% growth) while the 'low' revenue scenario is fixed at 3.0% annual growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less County Auditor Expenses (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>($41)</td>
<td>($42)</td>
<td>($43)</td>
<td>($44)</td>
<td>($45)</td>
<td>($46)</td>
<td>($178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less SANDAG Expenses (PUC 99233.1)</td>
<td>($596)</td>
<td>($496)</td>
<td>($530)</td>
<td>($530)</td>
<td>($570)</td>
<td>($570)</td>
<td>($608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3% Planning Funds (PUC 99233.2)</td>
<td>($3,837)</td>
<td>($4,004)</td>
<td>($4,272)</td>
<td>($4,123)</td>
<td>($4,795)</td>
<td>($4,374)</td>
<td>($5,112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2% Bicycle/Pedestrian Funds (PUC 99233.3)</td>
<td>($2,481)</td>
<td>($2,589)</td>
<td>($2,666)</td>
<td>($2,743)</td>
<td>($4,651)</td>
<td>($2,829)</td>
<td>($4,959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 5% Community Transit Service (PUC 99233.7)</td>
<td>($5,644)</td>
<td>($6,346)</td>
<td>($6,702)</td>
<td>($6,535)</td>
<td>($7,086)</td>
<td>($6,933)</td>
<td>($8,019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects</td>
<td>($2,419)</td>
<td>($174)</td>
<td>($1,544)</td>
<td>($1,733)</td>
<td>($1,882)</td>
<td>($1,882)</td>
<td>($7,836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Transferred Functions</td>
<td>($2,421)</td>
<td>($2,515)</td>
<td>($2,656)</td>
<td>($2,590)</td>
<td>($2,808)</td>
<td>($2,668)</td>
<td>($3,187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Transit Service</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>$4,438</td>
<td>$4,688</td>
<td>$4,703</td>
<td>$5,261</td>
<td>$4,849</td>
<td>$20,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Carryover</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available to Claim</td>
<td>$82,248</td>
<td>$87,888</td>
<td>$91,340</td>
<td>$91,340</td>
<td>$102,362</td>
<td>$94,214</td>
<td>$393,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available for NCTD</td>
<td>$32,814</td>
<td>$34,385</td>
<td>$36,444</td>
<td>$36,444</td>
<td>$39,876</td>
<td>$39,876</td>
<td>$159,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Regional Planning/Capital Projects</td>
<td>($24)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Transferred Functions</td>
<td>($548)</td>
<td>($576)</td>
<td>($609)</td>
<td>($594)</td>
<td>($663)</td>
<td>($630)</td>
<td>($2,663)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Transit Service</td>
<td>$1,571</td>
<td>$1,780</td>
<td>$1,880</td>
<td>$1,884</td>
<td>$1,988</td>
<td>$1,988</td>
<td>$8,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Carryover</td>
<td>$12,663</td>
<td>$11,331</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available to Claim</td>
<td>$46,476</td>
<td>$46,920</td>
<td>$37,715</td>
<td>$36,780</td>
<td>$39,876</td>
<td>$39,876</td>
<td>$165,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available for SANDAG:</td>
<td>$9,958</td>
<td>$7,891</td>
<td>$9,745</td>
<td>$9,511</td>
<td>$10,549</td>
<td>$10,094</td>
<td>$48,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning/Capital Projects</td>
<td>$2,442</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$1,544</td>
<td>$1,733</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
<td>$12,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred Functions</td>
<td>$2,969</td>
<td>$3,091</td>
<td>$3,265</td>
<td>$3,184</td>
<td>$3,452</td>
<td>$3,378</td>
<td>$14,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Transit Service</td>
<td>$113</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Expenses</td>
<td>$596</td>
<td>$496</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Planning Funds</td>
<td>$3,837</td>
<td>$4,004</td>
<td>$4,272</td>
<td>$4,123</td>
<td>$4,517</td>
<td>$4,242</td>
<td>$18,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available to Claim</td>
<td>$9,958</td>
<td>$7,891</td>
<td>$9,745</td>
<td>$9,511</td>
<td>$10,549</td>
<td>$10,094</td>
<td>$48,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Shown here for comparison purposes only, FY 2007 apportionment approved by the Board in February 2006

2 FY 2008 Apportionments are based on the County Auditor. The estimates for FY 2009 to FY 2012 are based on growth rate in retail sales as forecasted by the SANDAG Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM) and excludes interest and prior year excess funds. DEFM serves as the 'high' revenue scenario (between 5.8% to 6.7% growth) while the 'low' revenue scenario is fixed at 3.0% annual growth.

3 Apportionment distribution is based on the population estimates published by the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates as of January 2006.

4 Local match for federally funded regional planning projects.

5 Based on Addendums No. 3 and No. 4 to the Master Memorandum of Understanding between the 3 agencies.

### Other Notes:
The increase in SANDAG Administration cost in FY 2010 is due to costs associated with the triennial performance audit.
## Table 2
State Transit Assistance FY 2008 Apportionment and FY 2009 to FY 2012 Projections (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Discretionary Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$1,892</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>12,827</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>$5,719</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>5,891</td>
<td>9,113</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>9,466</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>6,437</td>
<td>38,769</td>
<td>30,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Discretionary</strong></td>
<td>$7,611</td>
<td>13,654</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>12,128</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>8,317</td>
<td>13,216</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>51,596</td>
<td>40,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operator Formula Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>$747</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista Transit</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Contract Services</td>
<td>$581</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Transit Corp.</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Trolley Inc.</td>
<td>$849</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Formula</strong></td>
<td>$3,417</td>
<td>6,131</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>5,656</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>5,934</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>23,166</td>
<td>18,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>$11,029</td>
<td>19,785</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>17,573</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>18,255</td>
<td>12,051</td>
<td>19,149</td>
<td>12,413</td>
<td>74,762</td>
<td>58,553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Total</td>
<td>$184,511</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>190,046</td>
<td>294,000</td>
<td>195,747</td>
<td>305,400</td>
<td>201,620</td>
<td>320,365</td>
<td>207,668</td>
<td>1,250,765</td>
<td>979,593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. FY 2008 apportionment provided by the State Controller.
2. The statewide estimates for FY 2009 to FY 2012 are based on the 2006 Fund Estimate which reflects the anticipation that the state will payback the borrowed Proposition 42 funds in FY 2009 (the revenues decrease in 2010 with the payback completed). FY 2012 projection is based on the average increase over the STIP period (4.9%) while the low range is a straight 3 percent annual increase. The distribution of revenues are based on the same share as FY 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>TransNet Transit Program FY 2008 Forecast (in $000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 TransNet Available For Transit Purposes:</td>
<td>$90,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 1% for Senior and Disabled Services</td>
<td>($903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$89,372</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available for MTS Projects and Services(^1):</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,786</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 60% for Rail Capital Projects</td>
<td>$38,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Debt Service (bonds and commercial paper)</td>
<td>($29,228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Minimum Available for Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,043</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 40% Available for Non-Rail Capital and Service Improvements</td>
<td>$25,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less BRT Transfer to SANDAG(^2)</td>
<td>($628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Pass Sales Subsidy to SANDAG(^3)</td>
<td>($5,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Available for Non-Rail Capital and Service Improvements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,386</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for ADA Services(^1)</td>
<td>$644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available for NCTD Projects and Services(^1):</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,586</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 60% for Rail Capital Projects</td>
<td>$15,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Debt Service (bonds)</td>
<td>($7,636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Minimum Available for Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,715</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum 40% Available for Non-Rail Capital and Service Improvements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,235</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for ADA Services(^1)</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available for SANDAG Projects and Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT Transfer(^2)</td>
<td>$628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Sales Subsidy(^3)</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Distribution based on the Department of Finance population estimates for January 2006 (2,188,817 for MTS and 878,003 for NCTD)

\(^2\)The development of certain Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects is part of the transfer from MTS to SANDAG. These projects are eligible under the operating portion of the original TransNet program consistent with the MTS Board action of May 2003.

\(^3\)SANDAG manages the prepaid fare media program on behalf of MTS.

**Other Notes:**

1. FY 2008 estimate is based on actual sales tax collected from July to December 2006.

2. This table is based on the 1987 Proposition A: San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.
Table 3a
TransNet Transit Projections FY 2009 to FY 2012
(in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Available For Transit Purposes¹</td>
<td>$46,840</td>
<td>$45,210</td>
<td>$49,571</td>
<td>$46,566</td>
<td>$52,562</td>
<td>$47,963</td>
<td>$55,196</td>
<td>$49,401</td>
<td>$204,170</td>
<td>$189,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2.5% for ADA-related Services</td>
<td>($1,171)</td>
<td>($1,130)</td>
<td>($1,239)</td>
<td>($1,164)</td>
<td>($1,314)</td>
<td>($1,199)</td>
<td>($1,380)</td>
<td>($1,235)</td>
<td>($5,104)</td>
<td>($4,728)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 3.25% for Senior Services²</td>
<td>($1,522)</td>
<td>($1,469)</td>
<td>($1,611)</td>
<td>($1,513)</td>
<td>($1,708)</td>
<td>($1,559)</td>
<td>($1,794)</td>
<td>($1,606)</td>
<td>($6,636)</td>
<td>($6,147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$44,146</td>
<td>$42,610</td>
<td>$46,721</td>
<td>$43,888</td>
<td>$49,540</td>
<td>$45,205</td>
<td>$52,023</td>
<td>$46,560</td>
<td>$192,430</td>
<td>$178,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTS Projects And Services:
- Available for Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital Improvements)
  | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | TOTAL |
  | $31,508 | $33,435 | $35,357 | $37,129 | $137,339 |
  | $30,411 | $31,323 | $32,263 | $33,213 | $127,228 |
- Less Pass Sales Subsidy to SANDAG³ | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($5,500) | ($22,000) |
- Net Available           | $26,008   | $27,845   | $29,857   | $31,629   | $115,339   |
  | $24,911   | $25,823   | $26,763   | $27,731   | $105,228   |
- Available for ADA Services | $836      | $884      | $938      | $985      | $3,643     |
  | $807      | $831      | $856      | $881      | $3,375     |

NCTD Projects And Services:
- Available for Transit Service Improvements (Operations and Supporting Capital Improvements)
  | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | TOTAL |
  | $12,639 | $13,376 | $14,183 | $14,894 | $55,091 |
  | $12,199 | $12,565 | $12,942 | $13,300 | $51,035 |
- Available for ADA Services | $335      | $355      | $376     | $395     | $1,461    |
  | $324      | $333      | $343     | $354     | $1,354    |

Regional Discretionary Programs²:
- Competitive Grant Program for Senior Transportation Services | $1,522 | $1,611 | $1,708 | $1,794 | $6,636 |
- $1,469 | $1,513 | $1,559 | $1,606 | $6,147 |

SANDAG Services:
- Pass Sales Program³ | $5,500 | $5,500 | $5,500 | $5,500 | $22,000 |

¹The Transit System Improvements share is 16.5% of net available revenues (after off-the-top deductions). These funds are available for operations and miscellaneous capital projects.

²Based on the TransNet Ordinance (04-01) Section 4(c)(2), these funds provide support for a competitive grant program for nonprofit organizations and local agencies for specialized transportation services for seniors.

³SANDAG manages the prepaid fare media program on behalf of MTS.

Other Notes:
1. Estimates are based on growth rate in taxable retail sales as forecasted by DEFM and excludes interest and prior year excess funds. DEFM serves as the ‘high’ revenue scenario (5.8% to 6.7% growth) while the ‘low’ revenues are based on straight 3% annual growth.
2. This table is based on the 2004 Proposition A Extension: San Diego Transportation Improvement Program and Expenditure Plan.
Table 4
Federal Transit Administration FY 2008 Apportionment and FY 2009 to FY 2012 Projections
(in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$33,057</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($594)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,980</td>
<td>($1,600)</td>
<td>($645)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,277</td>
<td>($1,600)</td>
<td>($686)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$14,339</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,420</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,404</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG (Planning/Vanpool Program)</td>
<td>$2,120</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$594</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,299</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,444</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG (Capital Projects 2)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$49,516</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$57,126</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$59,411</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,787</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$281,539</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>$10,996</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,922</td>
<td>($3,932)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,655</td>
<td>($4,647)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3,932</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,161</td>
<td>($5,215)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG (Capital Projects 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,647</td>
<td>$5,215</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,688</td>
<td>($5,430)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,424</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,641</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,866</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$26,752</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$15,708</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$16,344</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,721</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$18,802</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,554</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$89,174</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Federal apportionment for FY 2007 (2008 CIP) is not yet available; federal agencies are operating under a continuing resolution. Until the federal budget is approved, these apportionments are based on SAFETEA-LU through 2010; FY 2011 and 2012 growth is at 4% which is the average growth over the SAFETEA-LU period.

2 Regional Capital Projects refer to projects transferred to SANDAG to implement on behalf of MTS based on the 5-year CIP. While the regional projects for NCTD will be determined on an annual basis, future growth of regional planning is based on growth of the formula program (included in SAFETEA-LU) for MTS.

**Other Notes:**

1 SANDAG planning/vanpool share is based on the total increase in the two formula programs but not less than $2 million per year. The balance of 5307 funds are allocated between MTS and NCTD based on a historical formula (MTS - 70%; NCTD - 30%). The same 70/30 split applies to the 5309 funds (SANDAG does not share in this program).

2 For the FY 2008 5307 program NCTD share increases by $120K while MTS share reduces by same amount. In FY 2004 NCTD transferred $600K in Section 5307 funds to MTS to pay for a share of additional cost for the regional Fare Technology project. The transfer should have included $480K in Section 5307 funds and $120K in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for matching purposes. The original transfer left the project short on matching funds and this adjustment corrects that situation. The FY 2008 TDA apportionment also reflects this adjustment.
INTERSTATE 15 BUS RAPID TRANSIT OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE

Introduction

At the October 6, 2006, meeting, the Transportation Committee approved the initial Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) operations concept plan that included launching full BRT services in 2012 concurrent with completion of the north I-15 Managed Lanes/BRT facilities, and directed staff to report back on cost estimates that explore the potential for serving the Sorrento Mesa/University City/University of California, San Diego (UCSD) area in addition to downtown San Diego. The Transportation Committee also inquired about the status of designating a service operator for the 2012 BRT operations plan.

Based on additional analysis and coordination with both Metropolitan Transit Systems (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) staffs, SANDAG has developed a recommendation regarding the BRT service plan options and the designation of an operator for the 2012 BRT service plan.

Discussion

BRT Service to Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD

At the October 6, 2006, meeting, the Transportation Committee commented on the need to implement transit services to the employment centers in Sorrento Mesa, University City, and UCSD in 2012 with the initial start-up of BRT services in the I-15 corridor given the strong ridership potential from the north I-15 corridor as outlined in the October 6, 2006, agenda item. Staff was directed to report back on capital and operating cost estimates for serving these areas in addition to the planned BRT service to downtown San Diego.

Routing Alignment Options

Staff analyzed the potential of three alternative alignments for service west of I-15 to Sorrento Mesa and the UTC/UCSD areas, State Route 56 (SR 56), Mira Mesa Boulevard, and Miramar Road (Attachment 1). These alignment options were compared on the basis of travel time, patronage potential, and opportunities for stops and park and ride facilities. Our analysis concluded the following:

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve: (1) an I-15 corridor BRT operations plan for 2012 that includes BRT service to both downtown San Diego and the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD area, with an alignment along Mira Mesa Boulevard for the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD service, and (2) identification of MTS as the operator for the 2012 BRT operations plan.
• The SR 56 alignment option has the longest travel time and generates the lowest ridership potential (in part because of limited locations for stops and the low density residential and employment development patterns).

• The Miramar Road option has shorter travel times and ridership potential than the SR 56 option, but is out-of-direction compared with the Mira Mesa Boulevard and has a somewhat lower ridership potential.

• The Mira Mesa Boulevard option offers the fastest travel time and the highest potential ridership of the three options, as well as providing opportunities for park-and-ride facilities.

The Mira Mesa Boulevard alignment is the BRT recommended alignment for connecting the north I-15 corridor with Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD area. The NCTD Planning Committee requested that there be further examination of the possibility of providing direct service from North County via SR 56 to Carmel Valley and/or Sorrento Mesa/UCSD. Staff will continue to analyze this issue over the next few years as the SR 56 to Interstate 805 southbound direct connector is implemented, operational funding capacity becomes clearer, and future development levels unfold in the project area.

Operating and Capital Costs

Based on the ridership potential for this service in 2012, a 15-minute peak period service frequency is recommended (no service is proposed in the off-peak). The annual subsidy cost for this service is estimated at $2.5 million (2006 dollars).

BRT service between the north I-15 corridor and Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD is included in the TransNet program, but funding for operations is not scheduled to be available until 2016. We are planning to fund this additional subsidy between 2012 and 2016 from operating funds for other TransNet projects that will not be needed as early as originally anticipated.

With regard to capital costs, we evaluated whether transit priority treatments would be needed along Mira Mesa Boulevard to create acceptable operating speeds. While transit priority treatments will always be a benefit to BRT travel times, at this point they are not essential to the viability of BRT service. The highest potential priority treatment (queue jump at Black Mountain Road) is a low-cost restriping of existing road space, and we will be pursuing this separately with the City of San Diego.

Vehicles will be provided for the I-15 BRT services to downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD through two sources:

• TransNet provides $20 million for purchase of high-capacity vehicles which are forecasted as essential to meet patronage demand in the corridor, and

• Existing MTS coaches which operate the current I-15 corridor services.
**I-15 BRT Operator**

MTS is recommended as operator for the 2012 I-15 BRT service outlined above for the following reasons:

- A significant portion of the BRT services will operate in the MTS service area;
- Existing MTS operating subsidies committed to the I-15 corridor are a necessary part of the funding strategy for operations (along with farebox revenues, TransNet new project operating funds, and FasTrak®); and
- MTS can most effectively coordinate these services with other MTS local and regional services within the same service area.

**Next Steps**

While this item identifies the operator for the 2012 I-15 BRT operations plan, several other transit issues (such as, vehicle procurement, station amenities, feeder bus services, regional service coordination) still need to be resolved. In addition, the multi-modal nature of the Managed Lanes/BRT facilities means that there are other issues that involve more than just BRT operations. For example, the BRT station park-and-ride lots will be used by carpool users as well transit riders, meaning that maintenance costs will need to be shared expense. Potential joint development opportunities at stations will also involve numerous agencies.

In order to provide a comprehensive way to address these issues, SANDAG is working to develop a multi-agency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) designed to bring all stakeholders to the table to: (1) clearly outline all the relevant issue areas, (2) provide resolution for those issues, and (3) create the mechanism and flexibility for making future changes based on lessons learned from the operation of the Managed Lanes/BRT system. This MOU format would also be applied to other corridors where Managed Lanes/BRT facilities are being planned. The agencies that would initially be a part of this MOU include SANDAG, Caltrans, MTS, and NCTD. Other agencies that could be future partners include local jurisdictions (for example, on joint development projects) and the Riverside Transportation Authority (regarding possible extension of BRT services to Temecula).

Staff plans to return to the Transportation Committee with a revised I-15 BRT capital budget (including vehicle acquisition and parking structures at stations) based on the BRT operations plan recommended in this report.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. I-15 BRT Alignment Options: Sabre Springs to Sorrento Mesa/UTC

Key Staff Contact: Barrow Emerson, (619) 699-1961, bem@sandag.org
I-15 BRT Alignment Options
Sabre Springs to Sorrento Mesa/UTC

Map not to scale

- Red: Via SR 56 and I-805
- Blue: Via I-15 and Mira Mesa Boulevard
- Green: Via I-15, Miramar Road, and I-805
PROPOSED CHANGES TO FasTrak® PROGRAM – TRANSPONDER AND ACCOUNT FEES ASSESSMENT

Introduction

Since 1996, SANDAG has administered the FasTrak value-pricing program on Interstate 15 (I-15) which allows single-occupant vehicles to pay a fee for use of the reversible high-occupancy-vehicle lanes. The I-15 FasTrak was the first facility in the world to use dynamic pricing to collect tolls from solo drivers using the carpool lanes. The initial business model has not been modified since the program’s inception and currently limits SANDAG’s ability to cover business costs and provide parity with other FasTrak toll operators in the state.

The current I-15 FasTrak business model relies solely on tolls to cover the cost of operations. Although past years’ toll revenues were adequate to cover program costs, the combination of a growing customer base and declining toll transactions show that the current FasTrak business model does not provide adequate revenue to cover costs. During the two previous meetings staff has discussed business plan options with the Transportation Committee to address these problems.

At its meeting on January 19, 2007, the Transportation Committee reviewed various FasTrak business model options. Staff’s recommended option focused on cost recovery through a balance of toll revenue with account/transponder fees, achieving parity with other California FasTrak toll operators, and ensuring that frequent users were not overly impacted by any fee changes.

After reviewing the options, the Transportation Committee directed staff to report back with additional information on revenue management and interest earnings; program and fixed contractor costs; and the feasibility and impact of modifying staff’s recommended business plan option to include an incentive credit for FasTrak customers who use the I-15 facility.

Discussion

The following responds to the Transportation Committee’s requests for additional FasTrak program information.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the FasTrak $1.00 per month transponder fee, and $3.50 per month account maintenance fee, with credits to offset fees based on tolls paid; and (2) authorize staff to negotiate a funding agreement with the Metropolitan Transit System.
Revenue Collection and Interest Earnings

The FasTrak program generated approximately $75,000 in interest earnings last fiscal year. These earnings are accumulated through two accounts: an operational account maintained by the operator and the SANDAG pooled funds account. The interest rate during FY 2006 ranged from 3.1 percent to 4.7 percent. FasTrak revenue is collected through transponder deposits and pre-paid account fees.

- Transponder deposits are required of all FasTrak customers when they sign up for an account. Customers who do not use a credit card open a “cash account” and are required to pay a cash deposit for their transponder. SANDAG currently holds approximately $34,000 in deposit revenue from cash customers. Customers who use a credit card provide a “pre-authorization” to SANDAG to charge their account if the transponder is not returned as directed by FasTrak policies.

- Pre-paid toll fees in an amount specified by the customer (minimum $40.00) are collected when a customer signs up for FasTrak, and each time their account falls below $10.00 their credit card is charged to replenish the prepaid amount. These funds are deposited into the FasTrak operations account and fluctuate up and down based on toll road usage.

Program Costs and Fixed Contractor Costs

Operation and management of the FasTrak program costs approximately $100,000 per month or $1.2 million per year. Of this cost, SANDAG pays approximately $64,000 per month to its contractor for operations and maintenance of the system. The remaining $36,000 per month is attributable to life cycle costs for minor equipment, transponder replacements, enforcement, and other direct costs. On these latter costs, SANDAG has more flexibility in controlling the related expenditures.

When comparing the total $100,000 per month program costs against the 19,000-plus accounts, the SANDAG FasTrak program costs are approximately $5.00 per account. The $64,000 per month fixed contractor costs equates to approximate $3.50 per account. Under the proposed business plan the $3.50 administration fee would cover the fixed contractor costs and the toll revenues would cover the remaining costs.

Business Plan Option

Following the Transportation Committee’s direction, staff analyzed an option that provides incentives to use the FasTrak facility and still meet the other program objectives, including: cost recovery; peer parity; and equity among account holders.

Under this plan, SANDAG FasTrak customers would receive an incentive in the form of toll credits based on facility usage to offset the account maintenance and transponder fees. For example, if a customer spends $1.50 per month in tolls on I-15, they would pay $2.00 for their account fee and $1.00 for their transponder fee. If a customer spends $4.50 or more in tolls and has one transponder, their account and transponder fees would both be waived. This business plan option meets the program’s objectives with the added benefit of providing an incentive for customers to use the I-15 FasTrak facility.

JACK BODA
Departmental Director, Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Derek Toups, (619) 699-1907, dto@sandag.org
Introduction

The infrastructure bonds (Proposition 1B) approved by the voters in November 2006 added $2 billion to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) account. This report discusses potential funding options to program the San Diego region’s share of approximately $163.7 million in new STIP funds. TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) projects, such as State Route (SR) 52 Extension to SR 67, Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes and Bus Rapid Transit System, and the Blue Line, are proposed to be the top priority for funding, among other projects.

Discussion

Draft 2006 STIP Augmentation Funding Proposal

According to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), approximately $163.7 million in new STIP funds are available to program in this 2006 STIP Augmentation cycle. Of this amount, approximately $43.7 million are funds that would be advanced from FY 2011-2012. Also included is a target of approximately $35 million in Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds. PTA funds are restricted to transit and rail projects and cannot be used on highway projects. Likewise, the highway funds cannot be used on transit and rail projects. The breakdown is shown in Table 1 below.

| Table 1 | 2006 STIP Augmentation – San Diego Region Available Funding |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Highway Target (through FY 2010-2011) | Public Transportation Account Target (through FY 2010-2011) | Potential Advanced Funds (from FY 2011-2012) |
| $85,079,000 | $35,002,000 | $43,654,000 |

The projects recommended for programming in Table 2 comply with previous Board policies regarding the programming of new STIP funds. These policies place the greatest emphasis in completing projects already under way, focusing on TransNet projects, and programming the funding on projects that are ready or nearly ready to go to construction or implementation. The draft recommendations comply with Board policy by identifying projects that are ready to begin construction mainly in FY 2008 with a few in FY 2009. The specific policies are outlined below:

1. Complete projects currently programmed in the STIP.
2. Place particular emphasis on programming and completing TransNet EAP.
3. Program projects at the earliest possible time they can be constructed or implemented.

4. Maintain existing STIP funding levels as a minimum on existing programmed projects.

5. Reflect the efforts by the region and Caltrans to complete some of these projects outside the STIP through other funding sources.

Also consistent with Board policy regarding the TransNet Plan of Finance, 85 percent of the funds would be programmed on TransNet EAP projects, with the remaining 15 percent available for other projects. Of these TransNet EAP projects, SR 52 Extension (Item 1 in Table 2) is ready to begin construction within one year and the I-15 Managed Lanes South project (Item 2) shortly after that. The programming for the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit stations (Item 5) will replace $12.09 million in TransNet funds currently programmed on this project and help reduce the amount that needs to be borrowed for TransNet EAP implementation. The programming of the TransNet EAP Blue Line Trolley improvements will allow the early development of preliminary engineering for both vehicles and station improvements (Items 6 and 7).

Table 2
2006 STIP Augmentation Potential Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 STIP Augmentation: 85 percent for TransNet EAP (approximately $139.2 million)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransNet EAP Highway Project Options:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SR 52 Extension from SR 125 to SR 67, additional $23.454 million required to fully fund the Board-approved budget of $470.644 million: FY 2008</td>
<td>($23.454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I-15 Managed Lanes (South), additional $400 million required to fund construction, CMIA candidate: FY 2009</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SR 52 Widening, $150 million required to fund construction: FY 2010</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Remaining unprogrammed STIP funds for TransNet EAP Highway for I-15 Managed Lanes (South) and/or SR 52 Widening, pending CMIA adoption</strong></td>
<td><strong>$98.731</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransNet EAP Transit Project Options:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Blue Line Light Rail Vehicle (Low Floor) Procurement, $500,000 for vehicle specifications in FY 2008 and $51.5 million required to acquire 26 vehicles beginning in FY 2010</td>
<td>($0.500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Blue Line Station Improvement and Expansion Projects, $4.4 million for design and implementation of preliminary improvements in support of low floor vehicle operations: FY 2008</td>
<td>($4.400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Remaining unprogrammed STIP funds for TransNet EAP Transit projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 STIP Augmentation: 15 percent for nonTransNet EAP (approximately $24.6 million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-TransNet EAP Project Options</th>
<th>$24.560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Fare Technology “Smart Card” System - Under Construction</td>
<td>($2.800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Regional Transportation Management System - Implementation: FY 2008</td>
<td>($4.500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. San Luis Rey Transit Center – Finish Funding Design and Right of Way: FY 2008</td>
<td>($0.500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 1 percent SANDAG noise wall program set-aside</td>
<td>($1.637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. FY 2011-2012 SANDAG Planning and Program Monitoring: FY 2012</td>
<td>($0.630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Remaining unprogrammed STIP for non-TransNet EAP projects.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the 85 percent set-aside for TransNet EAP, because the I-15 Managed Lanes (South) project (Item 2) is also a candidate project for the Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA), and the draft recommendations are not scheduled to be released until February 20, 2007, no specific amount is identified for this highway project at this time. A possibility is that the CMIA program may cover the entire or a significant amount of the funding required for this project, thus freeing up STIP funds to go to the SR 52 Widening project (Item 3). Specific amounts are being proposed for TransNet EAP transit projects, however, these would not be impacted by the CMIA funding recommendations.

Staff recommendations for the remaining 15 percent in STIP funds include funding for most of the projects submitted by the North County Transit District (NCTD) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Of those projects submitted by the transit agencies and recommended for funding, per SB1703, SANDAG would be the implementing agency with the exception of the Blue Line Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition project (Item 6) and the San Luis Rey Transit Center project (Item 15). A listing of all projects submitted by MTS and NCTD are included in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. In addition to the projects submitted by the transit agencies, Attachment 3 describes projects submitted by SANDAG.

**State Local Partnership Program**

At the January 19, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting, staff had discussed how the State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) would be going through a project selection process concurrent with the STIP process to program these new funds. At the time, staff reported that the SLPP guidelines were in draft form, but that the CTC was still working to adopt programming of the first year of the SLPP program by June 2007. Since that time, CTC staff has indicated that they will need additional direction from the Legislature to finalize the guidelines and move into the project selection and programming process. Pending additional information from the CTC, staff will keep this committee informed of future developments regarding the SLPP program.
Next Steps

Staff will prepare a more definitive set of recommendations that will incorporate the adoption of the CMIA program and present it to the Transportation Committee at its March 2, 2007, meeting for final recommendation. The Board will be asked to review and approve funding recommendations at its March 23 meeting. STIP project submittals and associated documentation need to be delivered to the CTC by April 2, 2007.

RENÉE WASMUND
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. Metropolitan Transit System Submitted Projects
            2. North County Transit District Submitted Projects
            3. SANDAG Submitted Projects

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, (619) 699-1908, jnu@sandag.org
Metropolitan Transit System Submitted Projects

Of those projects recommended for funding, and with the exception of the Blue Line Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition project, per SB1703, SANDAG would be the implementing agency.

1. **CENTRALIZED TRAIN CONTROL SYSTEM**

   **The Project**

   The project will install a Centralized Train Control (CTC) System to provide remote monitoring and control of the signal, traction power and train to wayside control systems.

   **The Need**

   This project would facilitate expanded service on the MTS light rail system, a system that traverses ten cities and the unincorporated area of the County of San Diego. CTC would facilitate remote monitoring and control of the signal, traction power, and Train to Wayside Control System (TWC) for the light rail system. Implementation of this project would facilitate service expansion throughout the system.

   Currently, MTS is one of the only large transit operators in the nation without the ability to remotely control its light rail vehicles. The principal method for communication between the controllers and the vehicles is by way of Very High Frequency radio, and the primary means of controlling train movement is through the field-based automatic routing system. Trains are routed automatically upon occupancy of a trigger track circuit or by communicating between the vehicle and the wayside by way of the TWC. The controllers radio train operators when an emergency requires rerouting of the vehicle. Outside of the area covered by the train location system, the controller must rely on operators and field supervisors for information on the location of trains and conditions along the track.

   **Project Readiness**

   Specifications for this communications system are 95 percent complete. Procurement and implementation can begin upon release of the funds in July 2007.

   **Funding Status**

   This project is partially funded with $4.6 million under the draft MTS FY 2008 Capital Improvement Program. Total cost of the project is approximately $12.8 million. The MTS request to fully fund this project is approximately $8.2 million.

   **Project Study Report Status**

   In progress and will be completed by April 2, 2007, deadline.

   **Submittal Status**

   Staff recommends programming approximately $8.2 million implementation of this project.

2. **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

   **The Project**

   This project equips approximately 300 suburban and contract vehicles with computer aided dispatching and automatic vehicle location equipment for inclusion in the Regional Transit Management System.
The Need

This deployment will address (1) critical security needs through inclusion of emergency alarms, vehicle tracking, and remote monitoring; (2) performance monitoring by tracking of actual times against schedules, and automating passenger counting; and (3) providing the capability to deliver real-time arrival information to passengers.

Project Readiness

An initial phase to equip this technology on San Diego Transit buses is already under way. This project expands the implementation to other bus systems and is ready for immediate implementation upon approval of the funds in FY 2008.

Funding Status

MTS requests $4.5 million for this project. The initial project is funded with approximately $24.7 million in a combination of federal and local funds. NCTD has contributed nearly $7.9 million to the initial phase.

Project Study Report Status

The Project Study Report (PSR) has been completed, although a supplemental may be required.

Submittal Status

This project is included in SANDAG staff recommendation for programming.

3. BLUE LINE STATION IMPROVEMENT AND EXPANSION PROJECT

The Project

The project consists of expanding and enhancing Trolley stations along the San Diego Trolley Blue Line to accommodate growth in the region, and the move toward low floor vehicles. An initial phase of this project is to design and implement improvements on the existing track that will facilitate the construction of the station retrofit to allow for low floor vehicles.

The Need

The South Bay community in San Diego County is one of the fastest growing communities in the State. Traffic from the growing cities of San Diego, Chula Vista, National City, and Imperial Beach combines with freight and traffic from the International Border to create significant congestion along the South Bay highways. The significant congestion has led to a strong demand for transit options for commuters in this area. This project consists of the enhancement and expansion of station shelters and platforms in communities served by the San Diego Trolley Blue Line from downtown San Diego to the San Ysidro International Border. The San Diego Trolley Blue Line was built in 1981 and the stations were provided with simple station shelters. The stations and platforms no longer accommodate the high level of transit traffic, and will not accommodate the conversion to low-floor vehicles that will permit faster, more efficient service.

Project Readiness

This project is in the conceptual phase at this stage. Preliminary engineering during FY 2008 would be required, with construction beginning in late FY 2008 or early FY 2009 and completion in late FY 2010.
**Funding Status**

This project was recently included by SANDAG in the TransNet Early Action Program of projects. State Transit Assistance funds from Proposition 1B are also assumed to be part of the mix of funding sources that will be used to pay for this and other elements of the Blue Line improvements. MTS request to fund this project is $18.5 million.

**Project Study Report Status**

In progress, anticipated completion in late March 2007.

**Submittal Status**

Staff recommends that $4.4 million for engineering and implementation be programmed on this project.

---

4. **SOUTH BAY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY**

**The Project**

The project consists of right of way acquisition and design for the first phase expansion of the South Bay Maintenance Facility located in Chula Vista into a larger and more functional bus maintenance and operations base to accommodate growth in transit demand.

**The Need**

The South Bay community in San Diego County is one of the fastest growing communities in the state. Traffic from the growing cities of San Diego, Chula Vista, National City, and Imperial Beach combines with freight and traffic from the International Border to create significant congestion along the South Bay highways. This has led to a strong demand for transit options for commuters in this area. In order to accommodate that demand, the region has invested significant resources in expanded bus service, and future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects, particularly in the Interstate 805 corridor. To increase bus service and provide facilities for BRT, SANDAG, and MTS are planning an expansion of the current South Bay Bus Maintenance Facility. The current 5.1-acre facility was originally designed for a fleet of 80 buses; the expansion of the parcel to be acquired and reconfiguration of the site will result in double the site capacity. The site will also be able to accommodate all service trucks, relief cars, supervisor, and staff vehicles for South Bay operations. In the future, MTS plans to transition to all compressed natural gas buses at the facility, and to add articulated buses to the fleet.

**Project Status**

A site utilization study including a survey of the new area, and a maintenance facilities space assessment were completed in 2005. This study provides a more defined concept of the remaining parcel acquisition and the layout of the expanded maintenance facilities. This project has an approved federal Categorical Exclusion. Additionally, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed and approved for the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Project Readiness**

Preliminary engineering and right of way acquisition would be finished in FY 2008. Final design would be completed in FY 2009 and construction would begin in late FY 2009.
Funding Status

$8.1 million in federal and local formula funds have been programmed and expended for this project, leaving a funding need of $7.7 million.

Project Study Report Status

It has been completed, though it may need to be updated.

Submittal Status

Not included in SANDAG staff recommendation for programming. Although this project would provide benefit to transit operations, it does not compete well in the STIP due to the large size of request, and project readiness status as compared to other project submittals.

5. DOWNTOWN TROLLEY SIGNAL OPTIMIZATION

The Project

This project is designed to provide necessary infrastructure and signal optimization within the Downtown area (12th and Imperial to America Plaza) to provide effective movement of rail vehicles and auto traffic. The project would permit greater frequencies along this corridor and make transit a more competitive alternative, with a resultant increase in passenger throughput.

The Need

The Downtown area of the City of San Diego continues to see exponential growth due to careful planning on the part of numerous local agencies, and a robust economic climate that makes it an attractive alternative to suburban sprawl. Population in Downtown is expected to grow by 224 percent by 2030, while employment growth is expected to be 125 percent. As Downtown expands, the need for fast, effective public transportation becomes even greater.

Light rail signal improvements in the Downtown area would enhance the capacity of the existing facilities to meet that need. With the additional improvements in vehicular and pedestrian traffic as a result of this project, optimum traffic flow would be realized.

The focus of this project is primarily to address the additional capacity needs within the Downtown region. The project will reduce travel time and improve schedule reliability, thereby permitting increased frequency, while at the same time making transit a more competitive and attractive alternative. The result will be to reduce the demand on roadways.

Project Readiness

This project is in the conceptual stage. Additional discussions with local and regional stakeholders regarding the ultimate configuration of “C” Street in Downtown San Diego will likely have an impact on the scope of this project.

Funding Request

$2.5 million is needed over 3 years.

Project Study Report Status

The PSR has not yet completed, scheduled for completion June 2007.
6. **BLUE LINE LIGHT RAIL VEHICLE (LOW FLOOR) PROCUREMENT**

**The Project**

This project consists of the purchase of 26 new light rail vehicles for service on the San Diego Trolley.

**The Need**

New light rail vehicles will allow the trolley system to increase frequency of service. It will have the additional benefit of making use of the trolley a more attractive alternative to auto amongst choice commuters.

**Project Readiness**

Development of vehicle specifications and preliminary engineering could begin in FY 2008 upon release of funds. Vehicle delivery would occur in FY 2010.

**Funding Status**

This project was recently included by SANDAG in the TransNet Early Action Program of projects. State Transit Assistance funds from Proposition 1B are also assumed to be part of the mix of funding sources that will be used to pay for this and other elements of the Blue Line improvements. The MTS request to fund this project is $52 million.

**Project Study Report Status**

In progress, anticipated completion by late March 2007.

**Submittal Status**

Staff recommends that $500,000 be programmed to develop the vehicle specifications, in preparation for programming of acquisition of the low floor vehicles in a future funding cycle.
North County Transit District Submitted Projects

Of those projects recommended for funding, and with the exception of the San Luis Rey Transit Center project, per SB1703, SANDAG would be the implementing agency.

1. **ESCONDIDO RAPID BUS TRANSIT**

   **The Project**

   The project implements transit priority and queue jumpers on Route 350 (Escondido Transit Center to North County Fair).

   **The Need**

   Route 350 operates every ten minutes weekdays and serves downtown Escondido, a regional shopping mall, a high school, and a middle school. Implementation of this project should result in a 16 percent reduction in travel times on this route and significantly improve the schedule reliability for passengers.

   **Project Readiness**

   Transit priority improvements would be implemented within a year of funding approval.

   **Funding Status**

   The first phase of this project is estimated to cost $1.6 million. The second phase is estimated to cost $1.2 million. The third phase of this project is estimated to cost $2.5 million, for a total cost estimate of approximately $5.3 million. NCTD requests $5.3 million for this project.

   **Project Study Report Status**

   The PSR is in progress, anticipated to be completed by the April 2, 2007, deadline.

   **Submittal Status**

   Staff recommends that funding for phases 1 and 2 be programmed, for a total of $2.8 million. These two phases will implement transit priority treatments and queue jumpers along the corridor for immediate travel time savings and increased schedule reliability for this route. Due to additional work required on the local street network, it is recommended that Phase 3 be deferred and that it compete in future funding cycles once the additional work has been accomplished.

2. **SAN LUIS REY TRANSIT CENTER**

   **The Project**

   The project would construct a new 12-bus bay transit center and public improvements in northeast Oceanside.

   **The Need**

   The transit center site is located in a rapidly developing area of Oceanside, about 30 minutes from both the Oceanside and Vista Transit Centers. An interim transfer zone established in 2001 near the proposed site is already one of the top ten stops in the entire NCTD bus system. The new transit center will provide connections to the Marine Base at Camp Pendleton as well
as provide local service in the northeast Oceanside area and to the future SPRINTER train service that will begin operations in December 2007.

**Project Readiness**

The project has been environmentally cleared by both the City of Oceanside and the Federal Transit Administration. Final design and right of way acquisition could begin upon release of funds in FY 2008. Construction could begin as early as late FY 2008 or early FY 2009.

**Funding Status**

The total estimated cost of this project is $7.6 million. There is approximately $2.4 million in federal and local funds already programmed. NCTD requests $500,000 to finish design and right of way, and an additional $4.7 million for construction of this project.

**Project Study Report Status**

The PSR has been completed.

**Submittal Status**

Staff recommends that $500,000 be programmed to complete the design and right of way acquisition. Acquisition of this property and completion of design will put this project in a more competitive position for future funding cycles.

3. **SORRENTO VALLEY STATION PLATFORM EXTENSION**

**The Project**

The project location is at the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station (Milepost 249.0) in the City of San Diego. The project will extend the existing platforms at the station by 400 feet on both platforms.

**The Need**

The Sorrento Valley COASTER Station currently constrains COASTER trains to a locomotive and five cars. Additional cars require the train to double-spot (stop in two places). With this extension, the station would be able to support ten-car COASTER trains. With the anticipated growth in ridership along the COASTER corridor, NCTD expects to need to run trains with more than five cars each within two years.

**Project Readiness**

This project can be initiated and completed in FY 2008.

**Funding Status**

NCTD requests $1.23 million to finish design and construction of this project.

**Project Study Report Status**

A draft PSR has been completed. The final PSR is anticipated to be complete by the April 2, 2007, deadline.
4. **ESCONDIDO EAST OPERATIONS BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY EXPANSION**

**The Project**

The project site is located at 755 Norlak Avenue in the City of Escondido, adjacent to the Escondido Transit Center. The project scope includes the replacement of the NCTD BREEZE Bus Operations in the eastern section of the service area.

**The Need**

The current maintenance facility was last expanded in 1980 and is no longer able to adequately accommodate maintenance activities. The number and size of the buses for which this facility was originally designed has changed with a significantly larger fleet size and buses that are longer in size, resulting in maintenance activities to be accomplished in a restricted workspace or outside, weather permitting. Fixed equipment is outdated and often inadequate to properly service the existing fleet.

**Project Readiness**

The project was advertised once already but bids came in higher than the engineer’s estimate. NCTD and SANDAG request $2.232 million to re-advertise this project. Construction would begin as soon as funding is approved.

**Funding Status**

This project is already funded with approximately $5.1 million. An estimated shortfall of $2.232 million currently exists.

**Project Study Report Status**

The PSR has been completed and updated.

**Submittal Status**

Staff recommends that this project be programmed at $2.232 million. This project has been advertised once and is ready to be implemented. Completion of this project finishes the overall Escondido Maintenance Facility project.
SANDAG Submitted Projects

1. **FARE TECHNOLOGY “SMART CARD”**

   **The Project**
   
   This project implements automated fare collection technology on several regional transit systems, including the Trolley, San Diego Transit, COASTER and BREEZE, and other services.

   **The Need**
   
   Patrons of the various public transit systems currently need to deal with different fare collection media and fare structures. The Smart Card will allow patrons to easily and conveniently pay for transit services from the various systems with one single card. Transit agencies will also benefit from more efficient collection of farebox revenues.

   **Project Readiness**
   
   This project is currently in the latter stages of implementation and testing. The project is scheduled to be operational summer 2007.

   **Funding Status**
   
   This project is funded with a variety of funding sources, totaling $39.5 million. An additional $2.8 million is required to finish this project.

   **Project Study Report Status**
   
   Not Applicable

   **Submittal Status**
   
   Staff recommends that $2.8 million be programmed for this project to complete this project.

2. **SANDAG Highway Noise Barrier Retrofit Program**

   **The Project**
   
   This program is funded from 1 percent of new STIP revenues for noise barrier retrofit projects along the highway system. The Board of Directors directed staff to set aside 1 percent of new STIP revenues for this purpose beginning with the 2002 STIP cycle.

   **The Need**
   
   Noise levels exceed state and federal criteria at numerous residential locations adjacent to existing highways. Noise barrier retrofit projects help reduce noise levels at affected residences.

   **Project Readiness**
   
   The last time a call for noise barrier retrofit program projects was in November 2001 as part of the 2002 STIP programming cycle. A new call for projects would be issued in early summer. Projects would be reviewed in conformity with the SANDAG Highway Noise Barrier Program Policy. Funding would be allocated to the highest priority projects in late summer or early fall.
Funding Status

One percent of the new STIP funds represents $1.637 million. Given the high cost of construction materials, it is anticipated that not more than a couple of projects would be funded out of this set-aside.

Project Study Report Status

A Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report would be required of all submitted projects.

Submittal Status

These funds would be set aside until specific projects are identified.

3. PLANNING AND PROGRAM MONITORING (PPM)

The Project

The project provides funding for SANDAG staff to monitor project implementation and delivery.

The Need

SANDAG relies on these STIP resources to help fund staff for implementation of the activities outlined in its Budget Program, including project oversight and implementation, document review and development of business practice improvements. STIP funds for this activity are capped by state legislation.

Project Readiness

This is a continuous implementation activity.

Funding Status

Approval of staff recommendation would set aside funds for PPM activities in FY 2011-2012, which is outside the current STIP cycle. The actual programming would occur as part of the 2008 STIP process, which will begin in fall 2007.

Project Study Report Status

Not applicable

Submittal Status

Staff recommends setting aside $630,000 for this project to program as part of the 2008 STIP cycle.
UPDATE ON THE COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES AGENCY  

Introduction

In 2006 SANDAG approved the designation of Full Access and Coordinated Transportation, Inc. (FACT) as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for the entire County of San Diego. The CTSA is designated by SANDAG to promote the consolidation and coordination of transportation services for the health and human services sector. Formation of a CTSA is required by the Transportation Development Act (TDA).

FACT was originally created as a nonprofit corporation to develop a pilot consolidated transportation service in North County. The longer term objective of the organization is to extend the consolidation model to the rest of the County. FACT hired its first full-time employee in September 2007, and has assumed the CTSA functions previously handled by SANDAG, as well as planning for a North County Pilot Project for coordinated human services transportation.

The CTSA is eligible to receive TDA funds designated for consolidated human services transportation. In addition, in 2006, FACT obtained about $60,000 from the Community Transportation Association of America (CTAA), which was used to conduct an inventory of human services transportation in North County and lay the ground work for the pilot project. Also, last month, the SANDAG Transportation Committee voted to support the FACT grant request of $107,000 for mobility management under the New Freedom Program\(^1\) of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users). FACT will be using the New Freedom grant to carry on the planning for the implementation of the North County pilot program.

Mr. Rob Carley, Executive Director of FACT, will provide a full update of the work completed to date and an overview of what is planned for the future.

Discussion

Mr. Carley began work at FACT on September 11, 2006. Since that time he has worked on setting up the organization, as well as developing policies and procedures, and managing the CTAA contract. With regard to CTSA activities, FACT has coordinated two meetings of the Council on Access and Mobility which acts as an advisory group of transportation providers. FACT is planning a training workshop for transportation providers for March. In addition, the telephone and email requests for

---

\(^1\) New Freedom is a federal program designed to support coordinated transportation services, and planning for coordinated transportation for the disabled.
specialized transportation services, previously handled by SANDAG and North County Lifeline, are now being handled by FACT. Through January 22, 2007, 28 requests have been received and processed. The predominate need is for low cost, nonemergency, medical transportation.

A website on CTSA activities, originally developed by SANDAG, has been turned over to FACT and has been updated. In addition, FACT has made presentation regarding its vision for a coordinated system of transportation to 23 different agencies, groups or coalitions representing seniors, and/or people with disabilities.

FACT will be a recipient of funding through the SAFETEA-LU New Freedom Program in 2007, which will allow it to continue preparation of the North County Pilot Program and to improve its website. Specific activities will include:

1. Updating and validating the website and developing educational materials for distribution to staff and case managers in social service agencies,

2. Adding to the FACT Inventory Database, developed through the CTAA Planning Grant, by contacting faith-based organizations in the North County area,

3. Validating and updating the FACT Inventory Database in 2007 and 2008,

4. Developing an onsite vehicle and technology inventory to accurately determine resources in North County area, and

5. Evaluating call center locations and technology available in preparation for the establishment of a FACT call and dispatching center.

FACT will also be an active partner with SANDAG as the agency prepares the first Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
Rob Carley - FACT/CTSA, (760) 967-4197, rcarley@factsd.org
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, unincorporated County areas, San Marcos, and Escondido. The SPRINTER is a TransNet 1 funded project. In response to requests from NCTD and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), SANDAG staff is currently providing support and oversight services for the project and has been asked by the SANDAG Board of Directors to report on its progress monthly to the Transportation Committee.

Discussion

Current Progress

On the Mainline contract, approximately 22 miles of the 32 miles of total track construction has been completed. Platforms have been poured at 11 of 15 stations with canopy columns being erected. Station canopies are being fabricated with delivery starting in March. Station parking lot work has begun at two stations. Work to repair the Rancho Del Oro landslide began in late January and is expected to be complete in late March. All 12 DMU vehicles are on the property and are undergoing static, dynamic, and brake testing.

Schedule

Except for work at the stations, civil work on all three contracts will be substantially complete this spring. The revenue operations date is controlled by the systems construction (railroad signaling, traffic signaling, and communication) and by the start-up efforts of NCTD and its contract operator. The current critical path schedule shows the system and start-up effort to be complete in January 2008 compared to February 2008 reported last month. This improvement is due to the focus being brought to the systems work by the Mainline contractor. NCTD meets with the Mainline contractor and systems subcontractor weekly to track progress, mitigate delays, and look for opportunities to shorten work durations. The subcontractors have increased their staffing, and the general contractor continues to provide more areas for the subcontractors to work.

Communication equipment testing, delivery, and installation are also critical to the current completion schedule. In order to mitigate the risk associated with the equipment, delivery was expedited from June to March 2007 thus removing it from the critical path. However, this will require testing of certain equipment in the field rather than the factory.
The start-up activities such as pre-revenue training and testing can overlap some of the systems work. NCTD has developed a Rail Activation Plan to track training, testing, and all other tasks required prior to start of revenue service. The plan is now being implemented with the formation of teams to manage each of the tasks.

Given the above mitigations and the fact that the contractor continues to increase his systems workforce leads us to conclude that revenue operations should be able to start in December 2007 as planned.

**Cost**

The NCTD estimate at completion (EAC) is $447.7 million compared to $447.3 last month. This is the third EAC calculated under the new procedures set in place to control and predict final cost. NCTD can now track trends, analyze data, and make project decisions to mitigate costs or adjust the project budget. Note that the “not-to-exceed” budget included in the amended recovery plan for the FTA is $484.2 million.

**Project Concern**

As construction nears completion, a “punch list” is developed to tie up loose ends and uncompleted work on a project. At 22 miles long, the SPRINTER will have a significant punch list. However, we have observed the Mainline contractor and subcontractors have an unusually large number of unfinished work areas. NCTD is addressing this concern with the contractors so that it does not become a problem that could delay completion and the start of revenue service.

JACK BODA  
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
Good morning Vice-Chair Madaffer, 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.

The following message is a repeat of my Public comments given at the Metropolitain Transit System board meeting yesterday morning.

As you may see have my fund raising garb present. The 2007 MS Walk for land-lubbers will take place the 28th & 29th of April. Team Water Walkers of which I am a member has not set a date yet but by past years history would imagine Sat. April 21 is our day. The location will be the Mission Beach Plunge at 3115 Ocean Front Walk and will keep you informed of the final date when it is set.

Again I request your sponsorship donations of $20, $25 or larger amounts if you are able to be so generous. And for those writing checks please make payment to the National MS Society. If giving cash please a card or note with your address for a thank you message.

Want to thank some of you for your support in previous years, because of your kind support I and others with MS are able to swim at the Mission Beach Plunge for exercise and research continues around the country to find a cure. Please help us again with your kind sponsorship donations of any amount and I sure pray they find a cure soon so I don’t have to do this fund raising sh*tk anymore, last year you helped me raise $4,905 which placed me at position #32 of the top 50 fundraisers in the county, thank you!!!

Will be here after the meeting today and other meetings between now and the MS Walk to collect your sponsorship donations.
2.
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AI #2 Chuck Lungerhausen

Now on the public transportation front, had a letter to the editor in
the day before yesterday’s Union-Tribune that should start moving a
concept forward for the funding of new low-floor Trolley cars. Now
all you elected officials can support this idea of a 1/2 cent sales tax
increase right ??

On a final note miss two meetings here and former Chair Kellejian
has been replaced, well guess that is the turn that politics takes
every once in awhile. Will surely miss his mispronouncing my name
at most every meeting of this committee over the last few years and
of course the frienship we established over the years of his time as
Chair. Do hope he returns as a member of the public just like me and
gives his opinion of things here.

Thank you for listening and the opportunity to speak.
Introduction

- October 2006 – Initial I-15 BRT Operations Plan approved
- Staff directed to evaluate including Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD service in 2012.
BRT Service to Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD

- Three route alignments evaluated:
  - SR 56
  - Mira Mesa Blvd.
  - Miramar Rd.

Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD BRT Alignment Options

- Via SR 56 and I-805 (15 miles)
- Via I-15 and Mira Mesa Blvd. (8.7 miles)
- Via I-15, Miramar Rd., and Carroll Rd. (11 miles)

Map not to scale
Alignment Options - Travel Time (Sabre Springs – Sorrento Mesa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>SR 56</th>
<th>Miramar Rd.</th>
<th>Mira Mesa Blvd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.M. Peak westbound</td>
<td>20-25 minutes*</td>
<td>17-23 minutes</td>
<td>16-19 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M. Peak eastbound</td>
<td>17-22 minutes</td>
<td>20-34 minutes</td>
<td>17-21 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes introduction of southbound I-5 Bypass

Alignment Options – Patronage

A.M. 3 Hour Peak Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
<th>Alightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Rd.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd.</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Valley</td>
<td>42,047</td>
<td>59,110</td>
<td>64,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Mesa/Scripps Ranch</td>
<td>110,582</td>
<td>112,892</td>
<td>130,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRT Service to Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD

- **Alignment** – Mira Mesa Blvd. preferred option (lowest travel time, highest ridership)
- **Operating Cost** – Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD services can be accommodated from TransNet operating funds.
- **Vehicles** – Provided for I-15 BRT services through TransNet and use of existing MTS coaches.
I-15 BRT Operator

- Reasons MTS is recommended as operator for the 2012 I-15 BRT service:
  - BRT services will operate primarily in the MTS service area
  - Existing MTS operating subsidies committed to the I-15 corridor as part of the funding strategy
  - Efficient coordination with other MTS local and regional services

Recommendation

- I-15 corridor BRT operations plan for 2012 to include BRT service to both downtown San Diego and the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD area,
- Pursue an alignment along Mira Mesa Blvd for the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD service, and
- Identify MTS as the operator for the 2012 BRT operations plan.
**Future Updates**

- Parking Strategy and Station Designs
- Analyze Potential for Public/Private Funding Partnerships
- Develop Riverside Service Strategy
- Plan BRT Capital Improvements South of SR 163, including Mid-City Stations Strategy
- Create Multi-Agency MOU for I-15 Services and Facilities

**Recommendation**

- I-15 corridor BRT operations plan for 2012 to include BRT service to both downtown San Diego and the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD area,
- Pursue an alignment along Mira Mesa Blvd for the Sorrento Mesa/University City/UCSD service, and
- Identify MTS as the operator for the 2012 BRT operations plan.
Proposed Changes
I-15 FasTrak® Program
Transponder and Account Fees
Assessment

Transportation Committee
Item No. 5
February 16, 2007

Interest Income

- Interest generated from two sources:
  - Transponder deposits/prepaid account fees
  - Program reserves

- $75,000 in interest income last fiscal year

- Interest rate ranged from 3.1% to 4.7%
### Total Program Costs

**Major Cost Categories**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Operations</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll Collection System Maintenance</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (including transponders)</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement/Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Monthly Business Costs:** $100,000  
Approximate Number of Accounts: 19,000  
**Approximate Cost per Account:** $5.00  

![Image](SANDAG.png)

### Fixed Contractor Costs

**Fixed Contractor Costs**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Operations</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll Collection System Maintenance</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fixed Contractor Cost:** $64,000  
Approximate Number of Accounts: 19,000  
**Approximate Cost per Account:** $3.50  

![Image](SANDAG.png)
Transportation Committee’s Proposed Business Model

Plan’s Features:

- $1.00 per month per transponder fee, offset by I-15 by tolls paid
- $3.50 per month account maintenance fee, offset by I-15 tolls paid
- Covers fixed contractor and total program costs
- Provides incentive to motivate use
- Requires all accounts to support program
- Achieves parity with peer toll operators
- Minimizes “active account” losses

Customer’s View of Account Fees

Patrons start out with a $3.50 monthly account fee and $1 per transponder monthly fee

Example 1: Account with 1 Transponder

- Patron spends $3.00 on I-15 tolls during the month
- Total monthly account fees reduced to $1.50
- FasTrak program receives $4.50 from tolls, account and transponder fees

Example 2: Account with 2 Transponders

- Patron spends $6.00 on I-15 tolls during the month
- Total monthly account fees reduced to $0
- FasTrak program receives $6.00 from tolls (transponder and account fees waived)
Recommendation

Transportation Committee asked to recommend that SANDAG Board:

(1) Approve Transportation Committee’s Proposed FasTrak Business Model; and

(2) Authorize staff to negotiate a funding agreement with the Metropolitan Transit System

Proposed Changes
I-15 FasTrak® Program
Transponder and Account Fees Assessment

Transportation Committee
Item No. 5
February 16, 2007
2006 State Transportation Improvement Program

STIP Augmentation
Draft Recommendations

February 16, 2007

Background

• 2004 STIP cycle – No new money
• 2006 STIP cycle – No new money
• Prop 1B approved by the voters – includes $2 billion to augment the STIP
• 2006 STIP Augmentation – New money!
Funding Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Target</td>
<td>$85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Target</td>
<td>$35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance from FY 2011/12</td>
<td>$43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANDAG STIP Programming Policies - Summary

- Finish what has been started
- Focus on *TransNet* Early Action Program
- Focus on projects that are ready to go
### Options for *TransNet* EAP

#### Highway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
<th>Total 85% EAP Available: $139.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Highway EAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– SR 52 Extension</td>
<td>$23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– I-15 Managed Lanes (South)</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– SR 52 Managed Lanes Widening</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Remaining</td>
<td>$98.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Options for *TransNet* EAP

#### Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
<th>Total Available: $17.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– I-15 BRT Stations</td>
<td>$12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Blue Line LRV</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Blue Line Station Improvements</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Remaining</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Options for non-TransNet EAP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available:</strong> $24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Smart Card Project $2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Centralized Train Control System $8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regional Transp. Mgmt. System $4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Escondido Bus Rapid Transit $2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sorrento Valley Station Platform Ext. $1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Options for non-TransNet EAP Projects (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available:</strong> $24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Escondido Bus Maintenance Facility $2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- San Luis Rey Transit Center $0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SANDAG 1% Noise Barrier Retrofit $1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SANDAG PPM (FY 2011/12) $0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remaining $0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITOC</td>
<td>Feb 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Adopts CMIA</td>
<td>Feb 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Mar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>Mar 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Deadline for Submittal</td>
<td>Apr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Adoption of STIP</td>
<td>Jun 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL PROYECTO
La Autopista 94 (SR-94) es la ruta principal que permite acceso del área urbana de San Diego a las comunidades del sur-este del condado de San Diego y también al puerto de entrada de Tecate. El tráfico sobre la autopista 94 ha aumentado debido a un crecimiento en el área, cambios en el uso de las tierras alrededor, y crecimiento en el comercio internacional y viaje entre los Estados Unidos y México. El corredor también permite acceso a áreas recreativas en temporadas de vacaciones y en los fines de semana.

PROPÓSITO Y NECESIDAD
El proyecto propone mejorar las operaciones en un segmento rural de 18 millas de la Autopista 94, desde Melody Rd. hasta la carretera SR-188, cerca del puerto de entrada de Tecate. Para vehículos grandes y camiones semi es difícil transitar las curvas sin cruzar la línea central o salir sobre la orilla del pavimento. También hay falta de oportunidades para pasar vehículos manejando a velocidad lenta.

El propósito de este proyecto es hacer cambios que mejoren el movimiento del tráfico y aumenten la seguridad de la autopista 94. Los cambios propuestos incluyen adiciones de carriles para revasar, áreas y carriles apartaderos para autos y camiones, anchamiento de la carretera, y realineaciones de carriles.

FINANCIAMIENTO
Mas de cinco (5) millones de dólares se han asegurado del Programa de Operación y Protección de las Carreteras del Estado (State Highway Operation and Protection Program), para la fase Preliminar de Ingeniería y el Documento Ambiental (Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document (PA/ED)). Se esta buscando financiamiento adicional para las fases de diseño y construcción.

PREOCUPACIONES AMBIENTALES
Un reporte sobre el Impacto Ambiental (Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)) esta siendo preparado de acuerdo con el Acta de Calidad Ambiental de California (California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)) y el Acta Nacional de Política Ambiental (National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)) dado al numero de recursos en el corredor. Estos recursos incluyen impactos a la comunidad, lo visual/estético, el tráfico, los pantanos, recursos históricos y culturales, el área de inundación de 100 años, y receptores de agua y ruido. Todo esfuerzo será hecho para preservar la belleza natural del campo, las áreas recreativas, así como los refugios de la fauna y de las aves acuáticas, y de los sitios históricos, para cumplir con la sección 4(f) del reporte. Adicionalmente, hay en el área 75 especies amenazadas o en peligro de extinción.

HORARIO
Se espera empezar las juntas sobre el alcance del proyecto cerca del fin del año 2006, y completar los estudios sobre ingeniería y ambiente en el año 2009. La primera versión del Documento Ambiental se espera estar completo antes del fin del año 2009, y la versión final anticipada antes del fin del año 2010. El diseño y la construcción pueden comenzar desde seis meses después de finalizar el Documento Ambiental, solo para porciones del proyecto que no requieren adquisiciones de derecho de paso.

CONTACTO
Para más información sobre este proyecto, por favor de comunicarse con Sam Amen, Encargado de Proyecto, al (619) 718-7835.
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Current Efforts

- SR-94 Rural Corridor Environmental study is underway.

- Early operational projects with independent utility being pursued.

Corridor Needs
Corridor Needs

Problem Areas
Outreach Activities

Project website
Progress to date
- www.rural94.com secured for Web site
- Developed draft Website

Next Steps
- Web site on-line in March 2007

Target Environmental Study Schedule

**Short Term Projects**
- Develop Project Options - **Completed** Summer 2006
- Final Projects list June 2007
- Design and Construction for advance action projects (start 2008) TBD

**Long Term Projects**
- Complete Prelim. Engineering and Environmental Studies Spring 2008
- Final Environmental Document Summer/Fall 2010
- Design and Construction TBD
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Full Access &
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The Consolidated Transportation Service Agency
CTSA
For San Diego County

Rob Carley
Executive Director
810 Mission Avenue
Oceanside, CA 92054
760 967 4197
rcarley@factsd.org
www.factsd.org

VISION

- All people living in San Diego County will have full mobility within their community by an accessible transportation system that meets their individual need.
Milestones

- **March 2005** - Founders attend Project Action Mobility Planning Summit
- **February 2006** – NCTD/FACT received CTAA grant for planning
- **July 2006** - Designated as the CTSA for San Diego County by SANDAG
- **September 2006** - Hired full time Executive Director

Our Changing World

- **SANDAG Forecast 2030**
  - Age of 65 – 84: increase of 131%
    - 277,300 – 640,700
  - Age 85 and older: increase of 175%
    - 36,400 – 100,200

- **US Census 2005 – San Diego County**
  - Population 65 years and over – 310,836
  - With a disability – 117,927/38%
Transportation Services

- MTS & NCTD; Access & Lift
- Over 250 private transportation providers
  - Senior programs
  - Medical centers
  - Programs for the developmentally disabled
  - Veteran organizations
  - Schools
  - Faith based organizations
The CTSA - FACT

- Created by the Social Services Transportation Act 1979
- Object to improve transportation service for social services recipients through consolidation

**Resulting Benefits**
- Centralized dispatching
- Centralized maintenance
- Combined purchasing
- Consolidation of funding sources
- Centralized administration
- Efficient use of all existing sources of funding
CTSA in San Diego County

- STRIDE web site (www.stridesd.org)
- Council on Access and Mobility (CAM)
- Training for social service transportation providers
- Participate in development of the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan
- Outreach and Education on Coordination
- Consolidate and coordinate human services transportation

CTAA Grant: Survey of North County Stakeholders

- Preparing for North County Pilot Project
- 23% return on 345 surveys distributed
- 67% agencies operate transportation
- Seniors are the primary clients
- Positive response to concept of coordination
- 214,673 one way trips provided monthly
- 105 (39%) of vehicles will need replacement in next three years
CTAA Grant: Preparing for the North County Pilot Project, Recommendations

- Work to build credibility as CTSA
- Expand and update vehicle inventory
- Secure additional funding support
- Ongoing data collection
- Evaluate technologies
- Increase outreach

PARTNERS AND COORDINATION INCREASE ACCESS TO LIFE

**PARTNERS**
- Human Service Agencies
- Cities
- County
- SANDAG
- Faith Based Organizations
- Schools
- Medical Centers
- Transit Districts
- Stakeholders

**RESOURCES**
- Vehicles
- Volunteer Drivers
- Funding
- Ride Subsidies
- Vehicle Maintenance
- Paid Drivers
- Training
- In-Kind Support

**FACT**
- Through People Technology
- One Call Access
- Centralized Dispatching
- Centralized Administration
- and Commitment

**PROVIDES ACCESS TO LIFE**
- Community Experiences
- Family
- Medical Care
- Dental Care
- Employment
- Shopping
- Restaurants
- Friends

**CUSTOMERS**
- Seniors
- People with Disabilities
- Welfare to Work Participants
- Unemployed
- Low Income
- Transportation disadvantaged
- Cannot Drive a Vehicle
- Do not own a vehicle
- In need of a ride
Full Access &
Coordinated Transportation

FACT
The Consolidated Transportation Service Agency
CTSA
For San Diego County

Rob Carley
Executive Director
810 Mission Avenue
Oceanside, CA 92054
760 967 4197
rcarley@factsd.org
www.factsd.org
SPRINTER
STATUS REPORT

February 16, 2007

CURRENT PROGRESS

• Track: 22 of 32 miles complete

• Station platforms: 11 of 15 poured

• Station canopies: 1\textsuperscript{st} delivery in March

• Parking lot work has begun
CURRENT PROGRESS

• DMU vehicles: testing continues
• Rancho Del Oro landslide: repair work started
• SANDAG staff assistance

SCHEDULE

• All major civil work (except stations) to be completed this spring
• Systems and start-up work control Revenue Operations Date (ROD)
  – Systems work accelerated
  – Communications equipment accelerated
  – Start-up plan being implemented
• Critical path schedule improved
• December 2007 ROD still achievable
Mainline SPRINTER Rail Project
Banana Curve

Schedule of Remaining Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State University San Marcos Loop Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Civil and Track Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance Facility Construction - VMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup and Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COST

- Estimate at completion - $447.7M compared to $447.3M last month
- Budget: $484.2M

PROJECT CONCERN

- Large number of work areas left incomplete
  - Potential for future delay to critical activities and the start of pre-revenue training
  - Can be mitigated by a concentrated effort and “clean up” crews