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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS

• FIVE-YEAR TransNet REVENUE FORECAST

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ITEM #

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. MEETING SUMMARY (Greg Humora)

   The corrected meeting summary for the December 7, 2006, meeting, and the meeting summary for January 4, 2007, are attached. CTAC is asked to review and approve these meeting summaries.

   2a. Revised Meeting Summary for December 7, 2006
   2b. Meeting Summary for January 4, 2007

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

4. TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS (Stephan Vance)

   The TransNet Extension ordinance that takes effect in FY 2009 requires reasonable accommodation for bicycle and pedestrian travel for Congestion Relief projects using TransNet funds. The draft provisions were discussed at the December 7, 2006, CTAC meeting. Attached are the revised provisions for discussion purposes.

5. FIVE-YEAR TransNet REVENUE FORECAST (Sookyung Kim)

   Attached is the five-year TransNet revenue forecast for informational purposes.

6. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE (Rachel Kennedy)

   SANDAG staff will provide a summary on the status of the Comprehensive 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

7. TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROPOSAL (Jose Nuncio)

   SANDAG staff will provide a summary of the Transportation Infrastructure Bond Proposal approved by the SANDAG Board on December 15, 2006. The $1.6 billion proposal includes transportation improvements to the I-5, I-15, and I-805 corridors. SANDAG is competing statewide for funding as part of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program within the framework established by Prop. 1B, approved by California voters in November 2006.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

   CTAC members are encouraged to share items of interest.

9. UPCOMING MEETING

   Next CTAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 1, 2007, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

   + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
REVISED MEETING SUMMARY OF DECEMBER 7, 2006

Results of the meeting are summarized as follows.

Introductions

Greg Humora (Chair) chaired the meeting. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

Approval of Meeting Summary

The meeting summary from the November 2, 2006, CTAC meeting was approved.

Public Comments

Derek Turbide, Clean Energy, introduced himself and stated that his company provides clean fuel for public works and transit fleets.

TransNet Extension Bicycle and Pedestrian Provisions

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) introduced the draft guidelines for Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians Under the TransNet Extension Ordinance. Mr. Vance stated that the local streets and roads classifications used in the guidelines were according to the classifications in the City of San Diego guidelines. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) pointed out a few minor differences. Mr. Leja stated that the City of San Diego has a Bicycle Master Plan and it should supersede SANDAG guidelines. Carmen Kasner (Del Mar) stated that the guidelines would require that scarce roadway maintenance dollars be spent on costly new sidewalks. Kathy Keehan (San Diego County Bicycle Coalition) stated that bicycle facilities should not be ruled out just because they are not in a city’s Bicycle Master Plan. Frank Casteleneto (Poway) stated that it would be a rare case that vehicle lanes would be reduced to accommodate a bicycle lane. Steven Creswell (Santee) stated that the guidelines should not apply to maintenance projects. Bob Johnson (Carlsbad) stated that Circulation Elements of the General Plan in each city is approved after a public hearing and to attempt to change the approvals through guidelines would not be appropriate. Richard Chavez (SANDAG) stated that the TransNet Ordinance states that when TransNet funds are used for new or major reconstruction roadway projects, pedestrian and bicyclists must be accommodated unless the costs would be excessive or disproportionate to the need or probable use. Mr. Leja stated that there needed to be guidance on what qualifies as excessive cost. Greg Humora (Chair) stated that the guidelines did not need to be any more specific on this subject. Fred Luedtke (Escondido) stated he
thought the guidelines were okay. Mr. Chavez stated that draft guidelines would be presented to CTAC again on January 4 and February 1, 2007. The guidelines would be presented to ITOC on January 17 and to the Transportation Committee on February 16, 2007.

**Update on the Implementation of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Board Policy No. 033**

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) explained the policy and how it affects local agencies’ ability to compete for certain federal, state, and local transportation funding opportunities. During the prioritization process, a local agency would need to have an approved Housing Element to receive incentive points (25 out of 100 possible). At this time, one-third of the region’s local agencies have an approved Housing Element and another one-third are close to gaining approval.

**2007 Regional Transportation Plan White Paper: Emerging Technologies in Transportation**

Samuel Johnson and Linda Culp (SANDAG) presented a summary of emerging technologies including Vehicle Infrastructure Integration (VII), alternative fuel vehicles, and MagLev. Fred Luedtke (Escondido) stated that intelligent systems are going to revolutionize motor vehicles. Greg Humora (Chair) stated that smart cars will give additional capacity to freeways by automatically speeding up or slowing down based on traffic conditions. Chandra Collure (Solana Beach) asked about the status of the High-Speed Rail project. Ms. Culp stated that the state had appropriated $14 million to continue studies and that a tax initiative was scheduled for the November 2008 ballot.

**2007 Regional Transportation Plan White Paper: Interregional Transportation**

Due to the length of meeting, this item was continued to the January 4, 2007, meeting.

**Announcements**

There were no announcements.

**Upcoming Meeting**

The Chair announced the next meeting scheduled January 4, 2007.
MEETING SUMMARY OF JANUARY 4, 2007

Results of the meeting are summarized as follows.

Introductions

Greg Humora (Chair) chaired the meeting. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

Approval of Meeting Summary

Revisions were requested to the meeting summary from the December 7, 2006, CTAC meeting.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) White Paper: Interregional Transportation

Heather Werdick (SANDAG) presented a summary of interregional transportation issues. Mark Thomsen (MTS) asked if any interregional transit routes were planned. Ms. Werdick stated that Route 202 to Temecula, LOSSAN, and High-Speed Rail were being planned. Zoubir Ouadah (Poway) asked if I-5 forecasted traffic volumes assumed the completion of SR 241. Ms. Werdick stated that they did. Bob Johnson (Carlsbad) asked about planning for peak-period interregional truck trips. Richard Chavez (SANDAG) stated that the region’s managed lane network was being planned to accommodate off-peak truck trips, reducing the amount of truck trips in the peak period. Minjie Mei (Santee) asked about interregional home-to-work trips and their impact on the transportation system. Ms. Werdick stated that this was a significant issue on I-5 and I-15, especially I-15. Greg Humora (Chair) stated that the amount of commuters from Western Riverside County was a concern. Fred Luedtke (Escondido) asked if accommodating interregional trips was a good decision if the region was focusing on smart growth. Richard Chavez (SANDAG) stated that SANDAG was taking a combined strategy of focusing on both smart growth and interregional travel. Ms. Werdick stated that when polled, the SANDAG Board favored focusing on interregional travel than on affordable housing. Mark Thomsen (MTS) asked if SANDAG was looking at providing disincentives to curb interregional home-to-work travel. Ms. Werdick stated that SANDAG was looking at building toll lanes between SR 78 and the Riverside County Line. Ms. Werdick stated that this could be viewed as a disincentive.
Update on the Safe Routes to School, Bicycle Transportation Account, and High-Risk Rural Roads Programs

Erwin Gojuangco (Caltrans) provided an update on various upcoming and in progress State funding opportunities. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) asked if this information could be posted on the Caltrans Web site.

Excellence in Transportation Award

Erwin Gojuangco (Caltrans) presented an Excellence in Transportation Award to Kris Schackelford (City of San Diego) for the North Torrey Pines Road Bridge Replacement Project.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan White Paper: Interregional Transportation

Due to the length of meeting, this item was continued to the January 4, 2007, meeting.

Announcements

Majed Al-Ghafry (Lemon Grove) stated that he has accepted the position as City Engineer for the City of North Las Vegas and that Patrick Lund would be replacing him as Lemon Grove’s CTAC representative. Greg Humora (Chair) thanked Mr. Al-Ghafry for his service to CTAC and wished him luck in his new role. Kris Shackelford (City of San Diego) stated that she would be attending the next South Tehachapi Team Meeting. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) stated that the San Diego City Council would be discussing transportation project prioritization criteria at its January 16, 2007, meeting. Mr. Leja asked if anyone knew of a study on the impacts of Prop. 13 on home-to-work trips. No one did. Mr. Leja thought that this study would show that people were unwilling to move closer to their place of work because they would have to pay higher property taxes.

Upcoming Meeting

The Chair announced the next meeting scheduled for February 1, 2007.
TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS

Introduction

At the December 2006 Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) meeting, staff presented a draft implementation policy and guidelines for the provision in the TransNet Extension ordinance that requires new construction and major reconstruction projects built under the ordinance to provide appropriate accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians (Section 4(E)(3)). Members of the Committee raised a number of issues about the document and requested several revisions. SANDAG staff has reviewed the issues raised and made several changes to the document. This report discusses the changes that were made and discusses the policy issues raised by the Committee.

Recommendation

CTAC is asked to provide additional comment on the attached polices and guidelines, Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians Under the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

Discussion

The comments and issues raised at the December CTAC meeting fall into two general categories—technical changes and policy issues. Each of these is discussed separately, below.

Technical Changes

The attached policy and guidelines shows the changes in strikeout/underline that staff is proposing for the document based on the previous CTAC review. The substantive changes are in Table 1.

- For urban highways, the guidelines specify that neither freeways nor freeway interchanges should eliminate existing or planned bikeways on local streets and roads, ensuring that highway projects protect local bikeway improvements.

- At the request of the City of San Diego, the design speed for urban collector streets was changed from 30 to 35 miles per hour, consistent with the design speed specified in the San Diego Street Design Manual. In addition, the average daily motor vehicle traffic threshold over which additional outside travel lane width should be provided was increased from 5,000 to 6,500.


“Urban Residential Street” was changed to “Urban Local Street.”

The Committee requested that the guidelines provide a sliding scale indicating the maximum percentages that would be required to provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities based on the size of the overall project. While it may be reasonable to provide such guidance, there currently is no information readily available that would provide a basis for making these judgments. Staff continues to recommend that this remain a judgment that should be made by policymakers. Additional discussion on that process is provided in the following section.

**Policy Issues**

The policy and guidelines assume that where there is or will be demand for bicycle or pedestrian access, the agency will provide for that access. For the most part this is consistent with existing practices around the region. In those cases, where either high cost or low demand does become an issue, the proposed guidelines provide two points in the process for addressing the question. The first is when the agency holds the public hearing required for submitting projects to be included in the TransNet Program of Projects. The second is at the public hearing when the SANDAG Transportation Committee approves the Program of Projects. The intent of the policy is to ensure that there is an opportunity for a public discussion of the question through the notices of public hearings required, and through the review of the SANDAG Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee. The decision rests entirely with local elected officials either on the local city council or Board of Supervisors, or on the SANDAG Board.

One of the main concerns raised by the Committee was that this requirement would place a burden on local agencies to provide transportation infrastructure for bicyclists and pedestrians when they already lack adequate funding to meet the demands for additional motor vehicle capacity. This is not a condition that is unique to local agencies. SANDAG faces the same dilemma at the regional level. The purpose of this ordinance section is to encourage development of a more balanced transportation system consistent with the polices in the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Comprehensive Plan. The ordinance recognizes that there may be circumstances where “the cost of providing bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use.” The policy places the responsibility for striking that balance in the hands of local and regional policymakers.

Some CTAC members suggested that the implementation guidelines could be simplified by requiring that only TransNet-funded projects implement projects in existing bicycle and pedestrian plans. This could be a reasonable approach for ensuring bicycle and pedestrian access except for the fact that not every jurisdiction has a current bicycle and pedestrian plan.

The Committee also questioned whether SANDAG could require a local agency to implement a project that was not in its general plan circulation element. SANDAG does not have the authority to override adopted general plans, but it is within its authority to use its transportation funding authority as an incentive to encourage local agencies to adopt general plan provisions that are consistent with regional policies, goals, and objectives. Local agencies retain the option of using other revenue sources (e.g., state gas tax, Prop. 42 funds, or general funds) to implement projects where they feel the TransNet policy on accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians is inconsistent with their local plans and priorities.
Finally, a concern was raised about the impact of this policy on relatively simple projects such as street overlays. Because the implementation policies of the ordinance define a street overlay of one inch or more as major reconstruction, an agency would have to determine if the roadway on which such an overlay was proposed provided appropriate accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. Only in those cases where no bicycle or pedestrian accommodation exists would the local agency be required to make a judgment about the cost and benefit of completing the project with TransNet funds.

Next Steps

SANDAG staff will be taking the policy and guidelines to the Independent TransNet Oversight Committee (ITOC) at its February meeting. Based on the comments from ITOC and any additional comments from CTAC, staff would prepare a final draft of the document and provide a final opportunity for comment from the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee. The final policy and guidelines would then go to the Transportation Committee for its recommendation in March or April. The final decision on the policy is the responsibility of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Attachment: 1. Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians under the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
ACCOMMODATING BICYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS UNDER THE TransNet EXTENSION ORDINANCE
Policies and Guidelines

Background

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance states:

All new projects, or major reconstruction projects, funded by revenues provided under this Ordinance shall accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists, except where pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited by law from using a given facility or where the costs of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Such facilities for pedestrian and bicycle use shall be designed to the best currently available standards and guidelines.

What Constitutes Adequate Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Adequate provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel is determined within the context of the roadway type, its existing and planned surrounding land uses, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, and current or planned public transit service. When addressing the access needs dictated by land use, the responsible agency must consider demand created by current and expected land uses (as determined by the local general plan) within the useful life of the TransNet project. Table 1 provides appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Highway</td>
<td>• Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders. • Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway. • Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no less than 0.3 mile between crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/Facility Type</td>
<td>Bicycle Measures</td>
<td>Pedestrian Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Project</td>
<td>• Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand</td>
<td>• Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.</td>
<td>• Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no less than 0.3 miles between crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed &gt;30-35 mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway. Where average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 5,000-6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(design speed ≤ 30-35 mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential-Local</td>
<td>• Shared roadway</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/Facility Type</td>
<td>Bicycle Measures</td>
<td>Pedestrian Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Collector Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with no fronting uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with 85\textsuperscript{th} percentile speeds $\leq 25$ mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses and 85\textsuperscript{th} percentile speeds $&gt; 25$ mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Available Standards**

All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect’s California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the US Department of Transportations ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG’s Planning and Designing for Pedestrians is encouraged.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation in Reconstruction Projects**

Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right of way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right of way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility.
When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded

Section 4(E)(3) is based on the premise that pedestrians and bicyclists need safe and convenient access to the same destinations as other users of the public right of way. Consequently, those portions of the transportation network where pedestrians and bicyclists need not be accommodated are the exception, and the decision not to provide for them in a construction or major reconstruction project must be made by the responsible agency for good cause. Any impacts on the roadway’s motor vehicle capacity that result from providing for pedestrian and bicycle access would not, in themselves, justify excluding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, these impacts and their mitigation costs should be considered in determining if the cost of providing the facilities is disproportionate to the probable use.

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project.

The cost of providing for bicycle and pedestrian access can vary significantly relative to the overall project cost. For this reason, specifying a proportional or absolute limit on spending for bicycle or pedestrian improvements relative to probable use would not allow the kind of discretion necessary to make a significant investment in facilities when necessary, or to withhold an investment when the benefits are marginal. Therefore, the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclist and pedestrians must be a policy-level decision made by the Board or city council based on the body of information about context, cost, and probable use available at the time. Such a decision must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5(A) of the Ordinance.

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects

When an agency determines not to include bikeways or walkways appropriate bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects, the agency must notify SANDAG that expected bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification would be subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Transportation Committee, in approving the TransNet Program of Projects, would either or must concur with the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or the project would not be eligible for funding under the TransNet Program.
Remaining Issues and Questions

1. Need to develop a project development checklist of bike and pedestrian issues the project developer needs to consider. Items to include on the checklist:
   a. Review existing regional and local bike and pedestrian plans for planned improvements in the project area
   b. Pedestrian crossings should be provided about every 300 feet Does the project accommodate this need? If not, why not?
   c. Continuous lighting is an important safety and security feature for pedestrians. Does the project provide continuous lighting? If not, why not?
   d. ...

2. What happens if, after the pubic hearing on the funding, the local agency identifies a constraint they feel makes providing for bicycle and/or pedestrian access infeasible?
### TransNet Revenue Forecasts - Local Street and Road Program

**For Fiscal Years 2008 Through 2012**

(in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>98,607</td>
<td>276.0</td>
<td>$3,075</td>
<td>$2,816</td>
<td>$2,979</td>
<td>$3,158</td>
<td>$3,315</td>
<td>$15,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>223,423</td>
<td>383.0</td>
<td>$5,930</td>
<td>$5,425</td>
<td>$5,742</td>
<td>$6,089</td>
<td>$6,395</td>
<td>$29,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>26,248</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>$731</td>
<td>$672</td>
<td>$709</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>$785</td>
<td>$3,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>$228</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$222</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>96,867</td>
<td>191.5</td>
<td>$2,229</td>
<td>$2,474</td>
<td>$2,617</td>
<td>$2,774</td>
<td>$2,912</td>
<td>$13,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>62,815</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
<td>$1,763</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,974</td>
<td>$2,072</td>
<td>$9,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>140,766</td>
<td>287.7</td>
<td>$3,941</td>
<td>$3,607</td>
<td>$3,817</td>
<td>$4,047</td>
<td>$4,249</td>
<td>$19,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>27,563</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>$748</td>
<td>$789</td>
<td>$834</td>
<td>$874</td>
<td>$4,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>55,724</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>$1,265</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$1,672</td>
<td>$1,771</td>
<td>$1,858</td>
<td>$8,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>25,363</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>$801</td>
<td>$737</td>
<td>$777</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$861</td>
<td>$3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>63,537</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>$516</td>
<td>$1,548</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
<td>$1,734</td>
<td>$1,819</td>
<td>$7,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>174,925</td>
<td>424.4</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>$4,716</td>
<td>$4,991</td>
<td>$5,293</td>
<td>$5,558</td>
<td>$25,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>50,542</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>$1,473</td>
<td>$1,611</td>
<td>$1,703</td>
<td>$1,804</td>
<td>$1,893</td>
<td>$8,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,311,162</td>
<td>2,659.7</td>
<td>$33,870</td>
<td>$33,108</td>
<td>$35,059</td>
<td>$37,194</td>
<td>$39,075</td>
<td>$178,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>76,725</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>$2,236</td>
<td>$2,049</td>
<td>$2,166</td>
<td>$2,296</td>
<td>$2,409</td>
<td>$11,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>54,709</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>$956</td>
<td>$1,458</td>
<td>$1,541</td>
<td>$1,632</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
<td>$7,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>13,327</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>$502</td>
<td>$463</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>$514</td>
<td>$537</td>
<td>$2,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>94,440</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$2,355</td>
<td>$2,491</td>
<td>$2,640</td>
<td>$2,771</td>
<td>$12,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>465,553</td>
<td>1,889.4</td>
<td>$13,862</td>
<td>$15,264</td>
<td>$16,162</td>
<td>$17,145</td>
<td>$18,010</td>
<td>$80,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Street &amp; Road</td>
<td>3,066,820</td>
<td>7,399.3</td>
<td>$81,275</td>
<td>$82,608</td>
<td>$87,426</td>
<td>$92,701</td>
<td>$97,346</td>
<td>$441,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local EMP*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,110</td>
<td>$5,408</td>
<td>$5,734</td>
<td>$6,021</td>
<td>$6,273</td>
<td>$22,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Smart Growth*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,961</td>
<td>$6,309</td>
<td>$6,690</td>
<td>$7,025</td>
<td>$25,985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local System Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,679</td>
<td>$99,143</td>
<td>$105,125</td>
<td>$110,393</td>
<td>$314,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EMP to be distributed on a project by project basis through the RTIP; Smart Growth to be allocated based on Call for Projects process.

1. Forecast based upon updated SANDAG Demographic & Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM) estimates from September 2006
2. Table based on the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan for 1987 Proposition A and 2004 Extension
3. Local street and road revenues apportioned by the following formula: (a) each agency receives $50,000 annual funding base; (b) remaining revenues are distributed on a formula (2/3 population, and 1/3 maintained miles)
4. Local agency population from Dept. of Finance (DOF) estimates - January 2006
5. Maintained mileage from the 2004 California Public Road Data by Caltrans (September 2005)
6. Table reflects revenue estimates for planning purposes only. Fund allocations will be based on actual sales tax monthly receipts from the State Board of Equalization
7. Revenues are net of commercial paper repayment and bond debt service payments under current TransNet (FY 2008).