MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

TRANSNET INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (ITOC)

The ITOC may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Wednesday, February 21, 2007

9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

SANDAG
401 B Street
7th Floor Conference Room
San Diego, CA  92101-4231

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS
• TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM: ANNUAL BUDGET UPDATE
• TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE) REQUIREMENT
• UPDATE ON PROPOSITION 1B AND ITS IMPACT ON THE TransNet PROGRAM

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

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

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) members on any item at the time the ITOC is considering the item. Also, members of the public are invited to address the ITOC on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The ITOC may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE JANUARY 17, 2007 ITOC MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A summary of the January 17, 2007 ITOC meeting has been prepared for the Committee’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the ITOC on any issue within the jurisdiction of the ITOC. Speakers will be limited to three minutes each. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING (Colleen Clementson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) provides the strategic planning blueprint for the San Diego region in the areas of transportation, urban form, housing, environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, and border issues. The baseline monitoring report provides a performance monitoring system for the RCP. The RCP also provides the basis for the Smart Growth Incentive Program, which will be continued in the future as one of the new funding programs under the TransNet Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS (Stephan Vance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TransNet Extension Ordinance includes a provision requiring all new construction and major reconstruction projects funded under the Ordinance to provide accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian traffic where such traffic is legal and the cost of doing so is not unreasonable given the expected use. This item presents draft implementation guidelines for this provision of the Ordinance for review and comment by the ITOC. Any recommendations made by the ITOC will be presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TransNet EARLY ACTION PROGRAM: ANNUAL BUDGET UPDATE (Richard Chavez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The budgets are being updated for TransNet Early Action Program projects as part of the Overall Work Program (OWP) FY 2008 update cycle. At this time, budget increases are proposed for the Environmental Mitigation Program and the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations. As a follow-up to the discussion last month regarding the quarterly report, information will be provided comparing the project budgets included in the Plan of Finance process with recent trends in the construction cost index. Note: This item was not finalized at the time of mailout; it will be sent under separate cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum, SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 11:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures and the SANDAG independent assessment of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE) REQUIREMENT AND UPDATE ON ANNUAL AUDIT PROCESS (Renee Wasmund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 1:00 p.m. or following lunch break, whichever is earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide the ITOC with a review of the TransNet Ordinance requirement for an updated MOE base level for use in future annual fiscal and compliance audit work. The proposed approach to establishing the new MOE base will be discussed. The ITOC also will receive a status report on the current work for the FY 2006 audits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP): AMENDMENT NO. 3 (Sookyung Kim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REVIEW AND COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 1:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third amendment to the 2006 RTIP is scheduled for action at the March 16, 2007 Transportation Committee meeting and the March 23, 2007 SANDAG Board of Directors meeting. As shown in the agenda materials, TransNet Extension funds are being proposed for transit operations and capital purposes in FY 2009 and beyond. The ITOC’s role, as described in Paragraph 8 of the Ordinance is to review and comment on the proposed programming of TransNet funds. Any comments that the ITOC may make will be provided to the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors for consideration prior to action on the RTIP amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>UPDATE ON STATUS OF PROPOSITION 1B PROGRAMS (Jose Nuncio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 2:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff will provide an update to the ITOC on the additional funding to be provided from programs authorized by Proposition 1B, which passed in November 2006. The status of potential matching fund opportunities for TransNet major corridor projects from the Proposition 1B programs, including the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation process, and the State-Local Partnership Program, will be discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM #

10. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

The dates shown below have been suggested as potential meeting dates. The meetings are proposed to be scheduled from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The next meeting date and time will be confirmed at the end of each meeting. The ITOC may wish to suggest specific agenda topics for the next meeting. Potential topics for the next meeting include: a detailed update on the SR 52 corridor project, a status report on the Environmental Mitigation Program, and a report on the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan development process.

Scheduled Future Meeting Dates:

- March 21, 2007
- April 18, 2007
- May 16, 2007
- June 20, 2007
- July 18, 2007
- August 15, 2007 (if needed)
- September 19, 2007
- October 17, 2007
- November 21, 2007
- December 19, 2007 (if needed)

11. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

RECOMMENDATION

ACTION

Estimated Start Time:
2:20 p.m.
MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE JANUARY 17, 2007
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (ITOC) MEETING

January 17, 2007 Meeting Summary

Attendance-
Committee Members: Maryam Babaki, Hamid Bahadori, James Callaghan, Ron Gerow, John Meyer, Jim Ryan
Ex-Officio Members: Tracy Sandoval
Others: Kathy Keehan, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, Jack Boda, SANDAG, Richard Chavez, SANDAG, Sookyung Kim, SANDAG, Danielle Kochman, SANDAG, Dan Levy, SANDAG, Jim Linthicum, SANDAG, Jose Nuncio, SANDAG, Julie Wiley, SANDAG, Craig Scott, SANDAG

The following summarizes the major actions and key discussion points under each agenda item from the January 17, 2007 meeting.

Item 1 - Ethics Training for ITOC Members

Julie Wiley provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 1) covering the key legal requirements regarding conflict of interest, the Brown Act, the Public Records Act, and other issues related to members of the ITOC. She also distributed copies of SANDAG Board Policy #4 outlining rules of procedure for SANDAG committees. She explained that, because the ITOC was created by the adoption by the voters of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, ITOC members are considered to be public officials as part of the decision-making process even though the role of the ITOC is advisory only. She provided a detailed overview of the key legal requirements and explained that the purpose of this training was to make the members aware of some of the “red flags” regarding potential conflict of interest situations. She invited any member to meet with her to discuss individual circumstances and situations. She reviewed the differences in the rules for contract-related decisions as compared to policy decisions and covered many of the major exceptions to the established rules. She responded to numerous technical questions from ITOC members.
Item 2 – Meeting Summary for the November 15, 2006 Meeting

The meeting summary of the November 15, 2006 regular ITOC meeting was approved as written.

Item 3 – Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

Kathy Keehan, representing the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, introduced herself to the members and indicated that she would be back at future ITOC meetings when issues such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Guidelines are on the agenda for discussion. There were no other public comments.

Item 4 – Chair’s Report on SANDAG Board Comments on the ITOC Annual Report and the Role of the ITOC in the Coming Year

Chair Babaki reported on her presentation to the SANDAG Board of Directors at the October meeting regarding the ITOC’s first annual report. She reviewed the issues and challenges facing the ITOC with the Board members and felt that their response was generally positive. She reported that the Board members are looking for the ITOC’s input on key TransNet-related issues and take recommendations from the ITOC very seriously. She commented that one Board member raised a concern about the ITOC stepping beyond its advisory function and stressed that the SANDAG Board has the final authority in decision-making related to the TransNet program.

Item 5 – Quarterly Report on Major Corridor Project Status

Richard Chavez reviewed the materials included in the agenda package and provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 2) covering the status of the major TransNet corridor projects in terms of budget and schedule adherence. He asked for feedback from the ITOC regarding the information being presented and the format in which the information is being provided so that ongoing enhancements can be made in future quarterly reports to provide the ITOC with the information it needs to carry out its oversight function. He reported that the major projects are on schedule, but that growth in costs, as reflected in the construction cost index, is exceeding the growth in revenues. He provided some examples of individual projects running ahead or behind expected budget expenditure levels and reviewed some of the reasons behind these trends. Richard and Jack Boda discussed some of the work underway in reviewing the latest budget updates in coordination with the Corridor Directors, which is focusing on efforts to keep the projects within the approved budgets. Options and issues related to specific projects will be brought to the ITOC in the coming months. Jack also explained some of the alternative approaches in dealing with contractors to keep cost increases under control, such as construction manager at-risk or pre-construction services. He offered to provide more information on these approaches at a future meeting. Craig Scott briefly outlined the process that staff has planned over the coming months to update the Plan of Finance for the Early Action Program (EAP) to reflect these latest budget updates and the availability of matching funds from the state infrastructure bonds and other sources.

Hamid Bahadori described an industry peer review process that has been successful in controlling costs on major projects. This process involves a value engineering-type approach to review projects at key milestones (10 percent and 30 percent design stages) to look for opportunities for cost savings. Jim Ryan raised concerns relating to the proposed CARB requirements regarding diesel
emission standards that could drive up construction costs as major construction equipment would have to be replaced. Jim Callaghan asked for a comparison of the cost estimates included in the last Plan of Finance for the major projects and what we are seeing now with the latest budget updates. Richard Chavez said that could be provided at the next meeting.

Richard Chavez also described the amount of activity on the TransNet Dashboard Web site and some of the proposed enhancements to the Dashboard reporting system. He described efforts underway to break out support costs from capital costs on the reports, to provide a “yellow light override” function for the Corridor Directors, and to integrate performance measurement data from the PeMS system as part of the Dashboard reports.

In terms of feedback on the quarterly reports, John Meyer wanted to make sure that the meeting summary reflected the ITOC’s concern over the trends regarding costs increasing faster than revenue. Jim Callaghan was concerned about changing cost-benefit calculations as the costs rise. He expressed an interest in trying to evaluate how well the new management system (Corridor Director concept, etc.) was working in terms of controlling costs and schedules. For future reports, John Meyer requested the inclusion of more details on project-specific issues and that additional clarification and explanations be provided as part of the charts and graphs.

**Item 6 - SPRINTER Project Status Report and SANDAG Independent Assessment**

Jim Linthicum reviewed the information included in the agenda package and provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 3) summarizing the status of the SPRINTER project. He reported that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had approved North County Transit District’s recovery plan for the SPRINTER project, which was a very significant action in that it allowed the federal matching funds to continue to flow to the project. He reported that the project is currently 73 percent complete and that key activities include completing the signaling system and initiating operator training.

Jim Linthicum described the SANDAG role in providing oversight for the project and in performing an independent assessment of the cost to complete the project and the schedule for opening the line. He indicated that the current completion is estimated to be February 2008 as compared to the January 2008 date discussed at the last meeting. He reviewed some of the mitigation efforts being instituted to move up the schedule to achieve the December 2007 target date. He also reported that the cost to complete estimate was now $447 million, as compared to the $445 million last month. He reviewed the budget line items that contributed to that change. The cost estimate is still well below the $498 million approved as part of the Recovery Plan. Hamid Bahadori asked if the TransNet Extension funds will be credited back if construction costs come in significantly under the budget estimate. Craig Scott reviewed the crediting provisions in the final funding plan approved by the SANDAG Board, which would provide for a return of the TransNet funds.

Jim Callaghan suggested that a “lessons learned” report be developed for use in the development of future rail projects. Jim Linthicum responded that many of the procedures and processes that have been put into place for the SPRINTER will be very beneficial for future projects. The federal review process also has been tightened up significantly, and this process would be applied to all future projects including federal funds as well.
**Item 7 – Older Adult Transportation Needs Survey**

Danielle Kochman provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 4) summarizing the results of a recently completed survey regarding the transportation needs of older adults in the region. A full report of the survey findings also was included in the agenda package. She described how the results of the survey will be used to develop the coordinated public transit human services transportation plan, which is a new federal requirement, and to develop the criteria and guidelines for the new senior transportation mini-grant program under the TransNet Extension. The ITOC will have a role in reviewing the expenditures under this new program.

ITOC members had a number of questions related to the survey design and methodology. Maryam Babaki commented that it is very difficult for most seniors to understand how the current dial-a-ride programs work and that there is a general lack of information and understanding of what services are available. John Meyer concurred and stressed that better communication and outreach regarding the services that are currently available would be a good starting point. Hamid Bahadori commented that, as further work is done in this area, it is important to find out what people actually need and develop services to meet those needs rather than to ask seniors what services they currently use. Additional information will be brought back to the ITOC in the future as the TransNet senior mini-grant program is further developed.

**Item 8 – 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP): Quarterly Amendment No. 2**

Sookyung Kim reviewed the proposed amendments as part of the quarterly amendment process for the RTIP. She reported that a total of 48 projects were included in this amendment, including 9 EAP projects. She reviewed the key reasons for the amendments. The only TransNet street and road project in this amendment was from the County of San Diego. Sookyung explained that the project complied with the “70/30” requirement that the ITOC helped to develop last year.

ITOC members requested that staff work on some additional formatting of these RTIP amendments in the future to flag major TransNet Extension projects and make it easier to identify which projects ITOC members should focus on, to summarize the status of the formula share for local agency projects, and to clarify the 70/30 analysis for each local project.

**Item 9 – Update on Proposition 1B and Its Impact on the TransNet Program**

Jack Boda provided the ITOC with a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 5) describing the process for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA), which is one of the new funding programs created by the passage of Prop. 1B in November 2006. He reviewed the three major projects that are being submitted to the state for consideration – I-15, I-5, and I-805. Each project is consistent with the EAP, and the state funding will be essential to achieving the 50/50 match assumption which provided the basis for the TransNet Expenditure Plan. He outlined the schedule for this first round of the CMIA program and indicated that the region’s projects should be very competitive in terms of project readiness and the other criteria established for the program.

Jose Nuncio described the status of two other programs created by Prop. 1B – the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation process and the State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP). He reviewed the STIP process and the schedule for developing candidate projects for the $120 million in STIP augmentation funds expected to come to the region. He said that the SANDAG Board action on the Plan of Finance included an action to devote 85 percent of future STIP
funds to TransNet EAP projects. This policy would apply to the STIP augmentation funds. He also reviewed the status of the SLPP program which is intended to provide a dollar-for-dollar match for local sales tax projects. The region could receive approximately $150 million to match EAP projects from this new program. The guidelines and timelines for this program are still under development.

In total, the additional matching funds from the CMIA, STIP Augmentation, and SLPP programs will have a significant positive impact on the Plan of Finance for the EAP. Jack Boda described an effort being coordinated by SANDAG to put together a group made up of business leaders, contractors, elected officials, and other interest groups to help support project applications for funding under the various infrastructure bond programs when they are being considered by the California Transportation Commission and other agencies for fund allocation decisions. The ITOC will be kept informed of the progress on these efforts to obtain state matching support for the TransNet EAP projects.

**Item 10 - Future Meeting Schedule**

The next regular meeting of the ITOC was scheduled for February 21, 2007, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at SANDAG. Potential agenda items for the meeting included a report on the annual budget update process for the major corridor projects, an update on the status of the SR 52 corridor project, a review of the proposed approach to developing the new “maintenance of effort” requirement, and a review of draft guidelines for accommodating bicycle and pedestrian travel on major transportation projects.

**Item 11 - Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.
PART ONE:
LAWS RELATING TO PERSONAL FINANCIAL GAIN
Duty of Public Officials and Employees

- To be personally disinterested in matters where he or she is officially responsible
- Avoid even the appearance or possibility of a conflict
- SANDAG Standard of Conduct Policy
- SANDAG Board Policy No. 004

Bribery - Penal Code §§ 7(6) and 68

- Anything of value/advantage (present or prospective) or any promise to give anything
- Asked, given, or accepted,
- Corrupt intent to influence, unlawfully, the person to whom it is given in his or her action, vote, or opinion, in any public or official capacity.
Ethics in Public Service
San Diego Association of Governments / September 28, 2006 & October 5, 2006
Presented by Michael Blacher

Government Code §1090 Conflicts

General Rule
• A public officer or employee may not make contracts in which he or she is financially interested.
• SANDAG Board Policy No. 004,
  – Section 4 – Standards of Conduct and Ethics

Analysis

1. Is person an officer or employee?
2. Is there a contract?
3. Did the person “make” the contract?
4. Do they have a financial interest?
5. Is it a statutory “non-interest”?
6. Is it a statutory “remote interest”?
7. Does the “rule of necessity” apply?
Effect of 1090 Conflict

- Insufficient for interested party to abstain from voting
- Insufficient if contract is fair, just and equitable
  - Or even if more advantageous than another contract
- No “good faith” defense
- Contract is void

Political Reform Act Conflicts

General Rule

- No public official may make, participate in making or in any way use or attempt to use his/her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he/she knows or has reason to know he/she has a disqualifying conflict of interest.
- SANDAG Board Policy No. 004,
  - Section 4 – Standards of Conduct and Ethics
Analysis

1. Is the individual a public official?
2. Will official be making, participating in making or attempting to use position to influence a decision?
3. Does official have an economic interest in decision?

Analysis (cont.)

4. Is interest directly or indirectly involved in decision?
5. Is interest material?
6. Is it reasonably foreseeable that decision will have a material effect?
7. Is financial effect distinguishable from effect on public generally?
8. Is officials participation nonetheless required?

Effect of Conflict

- Member of board, council, or commission must:
  - Publicly declare the specific interest
  - Leave the room and refrain from participating
  - Only exception is if person has a personal interest and wants to speak during public comment
Conflicts of Interest When Leaving Office - Government Code §§ 87406.3 and 87407

- Public official may not make/participate in making/influence government decisions directly relating to any persons with whom public official is negotiating or involved with regarding future employment
- Elected official/city manager/chief administrative officer may not be compensated to act as agent/attorney/representative of another person for purposes of influencing former agency regarding legislative action/permit, license, grant, or contract proceeding/sale or purchase of goods or property

PART 2:
LAWS RELATING TO CLAIMING PERQUISITES OF OFFICE
Limitations On The Receipt of Gifts - Government Code §§ 89503, 89506

• A "gift" is any payment/benefit provided to an official that confers a personal benefit for which the official does not provide goods or services of equal or greater value, including rebate/discount not offered in the regular course of business to members of the public.

• No elected official/candidate/designated employee of a local agency may accept any gift(s) from one source worth more than $360 in a single calendar year.

• Disqualified from participating in decisions involving the source of gift(s) of $360 or more in previous 12-month period.

• Gifts aggregating $50 or more must be reported on Form 700.
Honoraria Ban – Government Code § 89501-89502

- “Honoraria” are: any payment for any speech given, article published, or attendance at conference, meal, or event
- Neither elected officials nor candidates may accept honoraria
- Within 30 days of receipt: return to donor; or deliver to your governmental agency without claiming as deduction from income
- Penalties: giver and receiver liable in civil action for 3x value; fine of up to $5,000 for receiver

Exceptions to the Honoraria Ban

- Exceptions reportable as income or gifts:
  - Hired to write book, play or screenplay
  - Travel, food and lodging in connection with speech or conference
  - Earned income resulting from bona fide, independent profession
- Exceptions NOT reportable as income or gifts:
  - Charitable or tax exempt non-profit contribution that neither references nor passes through public official
  - Received from family member
Misuse Of Public Funds -
Government Code § 8314,
Penal Code § 424

- Government Code § 8314 - Prohibits local official/employee from using (or permitting others to use) public resources for campaign/ personal purpose/ unauthorized purposes
- Penal Code § 424 - Makes it a felony

Gifts Of Public Funds Prohibited -
California Const. Art. XVI, Sec. VI

- All expenditures of public funds must have a public purpose.
- Legal Test: Does the expenditure serve the public interest?
- Practical Test: How would it look if it were reported on in the newspaper or on TV?
Prohibition On Free Or Discounted Travel - California Constitution, Art. XII, SEC. 7

- Public officers may not receive free or discounted travel from transportation companies, whether for personal or business travel
- Violation of the prohibition results in forfeiture of office

PART 3: GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY LAWS
Economic Interest Disclosure - Government Code § 87200

• Covered officials:
  – Board members
  – Public officials who are part of decision-making process concerning expenditure of public funds
  – Candidates for any of these offices
  – Other officials designated by SANDAG’s conflict of interest code

• Filed upon taking office/ leaving office/ annual basis
• Requires disclosure of personal financial interests
• Alerts public officials to conflicts
• Informs the public about potential conflicts
Brown Act

- Requires that public agency actions “be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly”

Who is Subject to the Brown Act at SANDAG?

- Board of Directors
- Policy Advisory Committees
- ITOC
- Other Committees and Working Groups designated by the Office of General Counsel
Posting Requirements

- Post agenda at least 72 hours before a “regular” meeting
- Must specify time/location of meeting
- Brief general description of each item
- Include items to be discussed in closed session
- No action may be taken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda

A Meeting IS:

- Any congregation of a majority of the members of the legislative body in the same time and place to hear, discuss or deliberate upon any item within the subject matter jurisdiction
- Includes:
  - Informal sessions or conferences
  - Telephone conversations for the purpose of making a decision
  - E-mails
A Meeting is NOT

- Individual contacts or conversations, but serial meetings prohibited
- Attendance of a majority of the members at conferences to discuss issues of general interest
- Attendance of a majority of the members of the legislative body at purely social or ceremonial occasions

Closed Sessions

- Permissible where allowed by statute
- Disclosure is illegal
Public Records Act

What Are Public Records?

- The Act applies to “any writings containing information relating to the conduct of the business, prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics”
- SANDAG – Public Records
  - Request Guidelines
  - Records not available to public
  - Fees
When are Public Records Subject to Inspection?

- Public records are subject to inspection at all times during the business hours of the state or local agency.
- Public records must be made available for copying upon:
  - receipt of a request which reasonably describes an identifiable record; and
  - upon payment of appropriate fees, if any.

Responding to a Request for Records

- Agency has 10 days upon receipt of the request.
- Notify the person whether or not it will comply.
- Notice of denial must state the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.
Examples of Exempt Records:

- Preliminary Drafts
- Pending Litigation
- Communications received from Legal Counsel
- Complaints and Investigations
- Personnel Records
- Library Circulation Records
- Financial Data
- Others as defined by Government Code § 6254

SANDAG Board Policy No. 15

- Records Management
  - Definition
  - Procedure
Enforcement

- A court may order production of records improperly withheld.
- The court shall award cost and reasonable attorney’s fees to prevailing plaintiff.

PART 4:
LAWS RELATING TO FAIR PROCESSES
Doctrine Of Incompatible Offices -
Government Code Section 1099

- Common law codified in 2005
- Offices are incompatible when any of the following circumstances are present, unless simultaneous holding of the particular offices is compelled or expressly authorized by law:
  1. Either of the offices may audit, overrule, remove members of, dismiss employees of, or exercise supervisory powers over the other office or body.
  2. Based on the powers and jurisdiction of the offices, there is a possibility of a significant clash of duties or loyalties between the offices.
  3. Public policy considerations make it improper for one person to hold both offices.

Doctrine Of Incompatible Offices -
Government Code Section 1099

- The public officer shall be deemed to have forfeited the first office upon acceding to the second. This provision is enforceable pursuant to Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure.
- Section 1099 does not apply to a position of employment, including a civil service position.
- Section 1099 does not apply to a governmental body that has only advisory powers.
- SANDAG Administrative Rules and Regulations Section 7
Competitive Bidding Requirements
For Public Contracts -
Public Utilities Code § 132352.4

- If the estimated total cost of any procurement exceeds $2,500
  - competitive bids or proposals are required.

- A simplified procurement method of obtaining at least three bids or proposals must be used for
  - procurement with a vendor, contractor or consultant
  - that will not exceed $50,000 annually.

- For procurement involving construction, equipment and/or supplies that will exceed $50,000
  - a formal solicitation of bids is required and
  - the agency must award the contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder or
  - reject all bids.

- For procurement involving services that will exceed $100,000
  - a formal solicitation of proposals is required and
  - the contract will be awarded to the proposer that receives the highest evaluation score
    taking price into account and
  - agrees to contract terms that are in the agency's best interest.

Nepotism

- The Fair Employment and Housing Act prohibits discrimination based on marital status, but allows employers to reasonably regulate, for reasons of "supervision, safety, security, or morale" spouses working in the same department, division or facility.

- Public official should not participate in decisions directly affecting family members.
Resources

• The Fair Political Practices Commission
  www.fppc.ca.gov
  1-866-ASK-FPPC (1-866-275-3772)

• The Attorney General
  www.ag.ca.gov
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Project Schedules

- I-805 Corridor
- SR-76 Corridor
- SR-52 Corridor
- I-15 Corridor
- I-5 Corridor
- Mid-Coast Corridor
I-805 South

SR 52 Managed Lanes
I-5 HOV & Lomas
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**KEEPSANDIEGOMOVING.COM MONTHLY SUMMARY STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>38,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>40,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>46,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>40,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>20,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to date</td>
<td>185,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MONTHLY SUMMARY STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>22,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>19,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>28,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>13,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>29,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to date</td>
<td>114,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEEPSANDIEGOMOVING.COM CORRIDOR WEB SITES: MONTHLY SUMMARY STATISTICS, 10/1 - 12/31/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>15,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>5,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76 Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>3,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Corridor Web site pages</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TransNet Dashboard v2.0

- Independent Support and Capital Charts

I-5 North Coast

Funding Plan for I-5 North Coast

Cash Flow To Date

TransNet

Millions of Dollars

Budgeted
Actual
TransNet Dashboard v2.0

- Independent Support and Capital Charts
- Cost Management System Integration
- “Yellow Light Override” Feature
- PeMS Integration
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Mid-Coast Transit

Super-Loop Transit
I-15 South

Funding Plan for I-15 South

Cash Flow To Date

SR 52 Extension

Funding Plan for SR 52 Extension

Cash Flow To Date
I-15 North

Funding Plan for I-15 North

Cash Flow To Date

TransNet
SPRINTER STATUS REPORT

Current Progress

- FTA accepted NCTD’s Amended Recovery Plan (ARP) - *No holds on Federal money*
- NCTD adopted ARP budget
- Project now fully staffed
- Track: 19 of 32 miles placed
- DMU brake testing began – no problems identified to date
New Controls

• Schedule controls in place, effective, and being maintained

• Cost controls are in place and are being monitored for effectiveness

• Design controls are in place, effective, and being maintained

SCHEDULE

• Construction 73% complete (70% last month)

• All major civil work completed by March

• Systems and start-up work control Revenue Operations Date (ROD)
SCHEDULE

• Critical path schedule shows ROD of February 2008 compared to January 2008 last month

• Mitigation - accelerate systems work and perform start-up activities concurrently

• December 2007 ROD still achievable

COST

• Estimate at completion - $447M compared to $445M last month
  – Fine tuning Mainline cost
  – Moving environmental work from operations to capital
  – More conservative formula to calculate contingency reserved for quantity overruns

• Change Orders @ 6.9% of work compared to 5.2% last month
PROJECT CONCERNS

• Schedule - systems work still behind

• Cost -- Additional costs to Mainline contractor due to design changes

• Cost - monthly updates require a thorough review

SPRINTER STATUS REPORT

January 17, 2007
Introduction

Purpose: To learn about needs of older adult transportation agency clients over 60 years of age

- Sampling Frame: clients of social service and transportation agencies
Survey

• Eleven Questions:
  – About the respondents
  – About typical transportation needs
  – About specific transportation services

• Distributed to 24,000+ agency clients
• Garnered 2,354 completed surveys (9.6% response rate)

Age

Most respondents are 60-79 years old (61%)
Driver’s License

32% do not have a driver’s license

Reasons for Not Having a Driver’s License

- Do not feel safe driving (33.3%)
- Use public transit (16.8%)
- License was revoked (9.4%)
- Problems with eyesight (8.9%)
- Don’t have a car (7.0%)
- License was restricted (4.0%)
- Medical Condition (3.3%)
- Other (17.3%)

Mobility Limitations

- 27% need assistance walking
  - Of these 51% use a cane
- 42% have other mobility limitations
  - e.g. “cannot walk more than ¼ mile;” poor vision

Type of Walking Assistance Used

- Cane (50.8%)
- Walker (28.1%)
- Wheelchair (17.1%)
- Other (4.1%)
Transportation Needs

• 41% of trips occur between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m.
• Most common travel days are weekdays
• Most common trip needs are medical and shopping
  – Medical trips needed monthly
  – Shopping trips needed weekly

Trip Origins and Destinations

• Most frequently reported trip origins
  – Oceanside
  – La Mesa
  – El Cajon
  – Poway
  – Encinitas
  – San Diego

• Most frequently reported trip destinations near hospitals
### Alternative Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>% Regularly Using Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit (bus and trolley)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Paratransit service</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental transportation services</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Senior transportation issues and demands will intensify in the future, which points to:

• Importance of smart growth policies
• Need for expanded travel training
• Need for enhanced transportation services for basic mobility needs outside of peak periods

Next Steps

• Develop the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan
• Develop the TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program
Coordinated Plan

- New federal requirement
- Identifies transportation needs of:
  - Individuals with disabilities
  - Older Adults
  - People with low incomes
- Provides strategies for meeting needs
- Prioritizes transportation services for funding and implementation

Project Selection

- Projects selected for funding must be derived from Coordinated Plan
  - Job Access and Reverse Commute
  - New Freedom
  - Section 5310
- Coordinated Plan will also be used for the Competitive Process for the TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program
California Voters in November approved a $19.9 billion bond act (Proposition 1B) encompassing:

- Highway Safety
- Traffic Reduction
- Air Quality
- Port Security/Goods Movement
Transportation Infrastructure Bond

Corridor Mobility Improvement Account

Qualifications:

» Must be submitted to CTC by January 16, 2007
» CTC will select projects by March 1, 2007
CMIA Program Requirements

- Discretionary Program/ typical county share formula will not be followed
- Geographical Requirement; 60% funds allocated to south and 40% allocated to north
- Geographically Balanced, no single region will receive a significantly disproportionate share

CMIA Eligibility Requirements

*Main goal of CMIA program:*
To improve mobility along highly congested highway corridors

Each Project Must:
- Be on State Highway System or major access route connected to SHS
- Either, reduce travel time or delay, improve connectivity, or improve safety
CMIA Requirements (continued)

Each Project Must:

» Improve access to jobs, housing, markets, and commerce
» Commence construction no later than December 31, 2012
» Add capacity with new lanes and provide operational improvements
» Corridor Management Plan

Competitive Regional Projects

I-15, I-5, and I-805 are located on the highly congested interstate system

Each project :

» Will add capacity and reduce travel time
» Has a regional funding commitment to help leverage bond funds
» Will be able to commence construction on or before December 31, 2012
Corridors:
1. I-15 Managed Lanes and BRT
2. I-5 North Coast Corridor
3. I-805 Corridor

Corridor Management Improvement Account:
4. I-15 Managed Lanes Segment
5. I-5 North Coast HOV Lanes Segment
6. I-805 Corridor HOV Lanes Segment
Proposed Corridor Improvements

1. I-15 Middle Segment
2. I-15 North Segment
3. I-15 South Segment

South Segment
Cost: $400 Million

Proposed Corridor Improvements

- EAP North Coast I-5
- HOV / Operational Improvements
- 9 Possible Projects

HOV / Operational Improvements
Cost: $900 Million
Proposed Corridor Improvements

- EAP I-805 Corridor
- HOV / Auxiliary Lanes Improvements

HOV / Auxiliary Lanes Improvements

Cost: $350 Million

I-15, I-5, I-805 Projects - Highly Competitive

- Each project meets the eligibility requirements set by the state
- SANDAG Board has approved these projects as high priority
- TransNet program assumes a 50% funding match
- SANDAG and Caltrans District are in agreement with the project list
I-15, I-5, I-805 Projects - Highly Competitive

- CMIA program won’t be able to fund all of our match requirements.
- Each Corridor project has multiple segments that if funded separately or phased will add benefits to the corridor.
- Important for the region to remain flexible.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the SANDAG Board of Directors:

- Approve the attached list of priority projects, I-15, I-5, I-805.
- Direct staff to submit these projects to CTC by the January 16, 2007 application deadline.
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INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

February 21, 2007

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: INFORMATION

REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted by the SANDAG Board in July 2004, is currently in the implementation phase. The Performance Monitoring Chapter of the RCP identifies a set of performance indicators to monitor the region's progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. The attached report establishes the baseline for performance monitoring for the RCP. The Board of Directors accepted the report on October 27, 2006.

The ITOC has expressed interest in the past in the topic of performance monitoring. Although the RCP includes more than just transportation, this report is being provided to the ITOC to inform the committee of the performance monitoring efforts being implemented for transportation and the other components of the RCP. The ITOC has received and will continue to receive presentations on monitoring and evaluation efforts underway through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process and through ongoing enhancements to the monitoring system for the existing transportation system.

The RCP also provides the basis for the Smart Growth Incentive Program, which is a new program initiated as a pilot program using federal funds and which will be continued using TransNet Extension funds. In future meetings, the ITOC will review the proposed approach for implementing the new TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Attachments for this report include:

- Attachment 1 – SANDAG Board of Directors agenda report from the October 27, 2006 meeting regarding the Regional Comprehensive Plan: Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring.
REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING

File Number 3006500

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2004, is now in the implementation phase. Chapter 8 of the RCP describes using performance indicators as a tool to track our progress in implementing the plan. Many of the strategies and actions recommended in the Plan will take years to develop and fund. Therefore, it is important to have a consistent and valid set of indicators that can reflect the sometimes subtle changes that occur over the long run. Future performance monitoring reports on these indicators will be used to assess the degree to which RCP implementation is influencing the quality of life in the region.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP is both a recommendation of the Plan and a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 included the specific requirement that SANDAG monitor progress through “realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the RCP itself and made available to the public.” The list of indicators was published as part of the RCP.

The RCP Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring establishes a benchmark for future monitoring. The Baseline Report discusses the significance of each indicator and identifies targets for certain indicators. Initial analysis of the data collected and a discussion of SANDAG’s work efforts underway that may influence performance over time also are included in the Baseline Report.

Discussion

When preparing the RCP, the Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the previous Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) developed a set of 39 performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP.

The complete set of indicators is included in the attached Baseline Report. Data are available for most but not all of the indicators. Where data were not available, the report explains when data are expected for future reports and identifies the source.
Report Highlights

While the focus of this report is on establishing a baseline for future annual performance monitoring, the report highlights certain areas where the region appears to be moving in the right direction and others where improvement is needed.

Moving in the Right Direction

- Nearly one-third of new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.
- Ninety-nine percent of the region’s housing stock is located within the San Diego County Water Authority’s service area.
- Transit ridership has trended upward with population growth.
- Crime has decreased.
- Beach closures have declined.
- Air quality has improved.
- The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources has increased significantly.

Areas for Improvement

- The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem.
- Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years as have total hours of delay per traveler.
- Many waterbodies have some degree of impairment.
- Several beaches are losing sand.
- Job growth in the region has been concentrated in low-wage industries.

Public Review

The Baseline Report was presented to a joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in August 2006, at which time it was authorized for release for a 60-day public comment period. The report was posted on the SANDAG Web site, and presented to the Regional Planning Stakeholders and Technical Working Groups in September for review and comment.

Staff received a number of comments on the report during the public comment period. Where possible, staff has made changes to the report, largely for clarification and further explanation. While one respondent commented that the report was overly optimistic, overall the report was well received. A summary of the comments received, as well as corresponding responses, can be found in Attachment 1.
Conclusion

Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle, though some will be more noticeable. This Baseline Report will serve as a benchmark for monitoring progress on a regular basis. If progress is not made over time, SANDAG, through its Policy Advisory Committees and the Board, may wish to re-evaluate the strategies and actions recommended in the RCP.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments
1. Summary of Comments Received Regarding the RCP Baseline Monitoring Report
2. RCP Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, ccl@sandag.org
## Summary of Comments Received Regarding the RCP Baseline Monitoring Report

The following comments were received during the public comment period or during one of the following meetings:

- **August 4, 2006** Joint Regional Planning Committee/Transportation Committee
- **September 14, 2006** Regional Planning Technical Working Group
- **September 19, 2006** Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments on Indicators</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Form and Transportation</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An indicator that measures public health/safety should be added.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Will be considered for future reports or the RCP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion is overmeasured; tradeoffs should be reflected.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There should be an indicator of goods movement by modality.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – There is currently no policy basis for this in the RCP or RTP, but could be considered in RCP or RTP updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The CMP also includes programs to encourage bicycling and walking through RideLink – this should be noted in the SANDAG Role section.</td>
<td>• <strong>Change Made</strong> - Information added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SANDAG Role section should include the $7 million in TransNet funding that will be spent on bicycle and pedestrian projects.</td>
<td>• <strong>Change Made</strong> - Information added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of New Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ¼ mile proximity to freeways and major transit corridors should be added as a subindicator to better tabulate where smart growth is occurring.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> - Addressed; SGOAs are within ¼ mile of existing or planned transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in density should be added as a sub-indicator to better tabulate where smart growth is occurring.</td>
<td>• <strong>Change Made</strong> - Data added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The use of this indicator as a measure of sprawl may be criticized – just because a location is within the service area does not mean it is low density and located near transit.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Transit Ridership</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion of commuters that use transit is a better indicator of performance than number of transit riders.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Addressed; Captured in Commute Mode Share indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There should be a ratio of annual transit ridership to VMT.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Addressed; Ridership and VMT are benchmarked within this indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments on Indicators</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Commute Mode Share** -  
  - Mode share needs to be identified for major transit corridors.  
  - No mention is made of walking, biking, or other commute mode shares. If we do not have that data, the report needs to note that, and recommend a plan for collecting that data for future monitoring.  
  - Many people are no longer commuting to their jobs and are becoming cyber-employees – we should measure how successful the region is doing in this area.  
| **No Change Made** - Addressed; Data not currently available but will be included in Travel Times and Volumes in Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors indicator in future reports.  
| **Change Made** - Data added; Data source does not explicitly identify biking mode share, but is presumably included under “Other means.” Sources of data for biking mode share will be investigated for future reports.  
| **Change Made** - Data added. |
| **Travel Times and Volumes in Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors** -  
  - Add faster commute times on transit (e.g. speeding up trolley passage through downtown corridor).  
  - Monitoring should also include trip length.  
| **No Change Made** - Could be addressed in future reports when data is available.  
| **No Change Made** - Data not available. |
| **Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler** -  
  - Add various sub-locations as points of measurement, specifically at San Ysidro Port of Entry (SYPOE).  
  - Delay is not solely a result of congestion. It also stems from decisions about where to live, where to work, where to shop, etc.  
| **No Change Made** - Data not available. This request is not regional in nature.  
| **Change Made** - Explanation added. |
| **Housing** -  
  - The housing numbers need to be put in context with actual home sales of both existing and new homes, as well as condominium shares and resales.  
| **Change Made** - Explanation added. |
| **Housing Affordability Index** -  
  - Add relative percentage for Baja, to include renters.  
| **No Change Made** - Data not available. |
| **Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater than 35% of Income** -  
  - This indicator should be broken down by household income; need to look at those that are spending more than 50% of their income on housing costs.  
| **No Change Made** - Data not available; data source for this indicator (American Community Survey) is not broken out beyond 35%. |
| **Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units** -  
  - This indicator does not capture the increase in the number of low-paying jobs and high-cost homes.  
<p>| <strong>Change Made</strong> - Information added. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments on Indicators</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category</strong> - Add condos.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Data is not available. Condos may be included in the multi-family OR single-family totals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Index</strong> –</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Addressed in the report; Nitric Oxide is already accounted for in examination of ozone, as it is one of the precursors to ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider all non-attainment air quality standards, some of which are projected to worsen, such as Nitric Oxide.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Data not available. This request is not regional in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add various location points of measurement, specifically at SYPOE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Poverty Rate</strong> –</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Data not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add sub-measures where smart growth is occurring, such as increasing sales tax and property tax revenues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Facilities</strong> –</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – An indicator identifying San Diego’s major sources of energy for electricity and transportation could be considered for future reports pending data availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electricity, renewable, and indigenous supply is not enough – we need to know how much of all fuels are being used.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Comment noted; groundwater is one of several sources taken into account in the diversity of water supply indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The actual measure of groundwater security is the ratio of recharge to discharge.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – This indicator could be considered for future reports pending data availability; would be covered if an energy resource mix indicator is incorporated in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our energy security either mobile or industrial or residential is not captured.</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Data not available. This request is not regional in nature; the public facilities chapter of the RCP deals only with facilities that are regional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public facilities definition should be expanded to incorporate quality/quantity of street lighting, public sidewalks, and freeway access, in addition to park and green spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity of Water Supply</strong> –</td>
<td>• <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Comment noted; without data from the United States Bureau of Reclamation to confirm this statement, it must be assumed that the San Diego County Water Authority is meeting its mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This measure is flawed, as it assumes SDCWA allotment from MWD or IID is stable (in reality USBR may declare a shortage in 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments on Indicators</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Amount of Reclaimed Water Used**<br>• The County Water Authority’s goal of only 6% recycled water by 2020 is meager.<br>• Measure increases in miles of piping, especially in urbanized areas. | **No Change Made** – Comment noted; the targets are based on goals set in existing plans.  
**No Change Made** – This could be considered as a supplemental measure in future reports, pending data availability. |
| **Percent of Waste That is Recycled**<br>• Waste disposal should be measured rather than waste recycled.<br>• Refer to the Public Resource Code section that refers to this rather than AB939 (Public Resource Code Sections 41780-41786). | **No Change Made** – Addressed; waste disposal total is obtained by subtracting the percent of waste recycled from 100.  
**Change Made** – Reference added. |
<p>| <strong>Borders</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Where are forward action plans (such as the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan) related to the Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times study? | <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Beyond the scope of this monitoring report. |
| <strong>Interregional Traffic Volumes</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Need a sub-indicator per specific locations; should include SYPOE, including separating vehicles and pedestrians. | <strong>Change Made</strong> – Data provided; the SYPOE is captured in the Baja California category. |
| <strong>Border Wait Times</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Need to monitor southbound crossing. | <strong>No Change Made</strong> – Data not available. Congestion is captured in other indicators. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>No Change Made</strong> – This could be considered in future reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Committees need to look at what industry standards are, and/or what other areas are doing to set targets.</td>
<td><strong>No Change Made</strong> – This could be considered in future reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific targets need to be met, and if not, a decision needs to be made as to what is going to be done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Release</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SANDAG should hold a press conference regarding this report.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The timing of this document’s release is very important, particularly close to an election season.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The information in the baseline report should be laid out in an executive summary type document, in the context of the strategies of the RCP and RTP.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted</strong> - Will produce fact sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The data included in this report should be posted to SANDAG’s website and updated on a monthly basis.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted</strong> - Is posted on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SANDAG is truly good at providing quality information. This report contains a lot of good information.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is a great report with a great format, and is very well done.</td>
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<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
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<td>• The report is overly optimistic.</td>
<td><strong>Comment noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

During the next 30 years, San Diego County is expected to grow by more than one million people, bringing the total population to almost four million. Many of these people will be our children and grandchildren. Where will they live? Where will they work? And what will the region around them be like?

The region’s 19 local governments, working under the umbrella of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), have developed a plan to address our region’s projected population growth. The goal is to ensure a high quality of life for ourselves and our future generations — to work toward a society that has resolved its housing shortage, transportation problems, and energy issues, and provides healthy, desirable environments for people and nature.

MANDATE ON MONITORING RCP PERFORMANCE

Thousands of people collaborated to produce the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) over a nearly two-year period. Individuals, stakeholders, planning directors, public works directors, city managers, community-based organizations, elected officials, and representatives from tribal governments, state and federal agencies, neighboring counties, and the Republic of Mexico all contributed to the plan’s formation. The RCP was adopted by the SANDAG Board in July of 2004.

The result is a consensus statement of the region’s vision, core values, key issues, goals, objectives, and needed actions. It is a comprehensive summary of where we are today, where we want to be tomorrow, and what we need to do to get there.

But how will we track our progress? In many cases, we are talking about making major changes in our current ways of doing business, looking out 30 years and beyond. Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle. Some will be more noticeable. Over time, however, smart decisions and the cumulative effects of our actions will result in the future that the plan envisions.
Monitoring our progress is not just a good idea, it’s a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 (Kehoe) was signed into law in September 2003. It declares that the intent of the legislature is that SANDAG shall “complete the public process of preparing and adopting a regional comprehensive plan...by June 30, 2004.” And it contains specific language regarding monitoring:

“To ensure that the vision and goals of the regional comprehensive plan are implemented, the consolidated agency [SANDAG] must monitor its progress through realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the regional comprehensive plan itself and made available to the public.”

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVES**

Because of the wide range of actions included in the RCP, participants developed a list of “Strategic Initiatives,” that is, sets of priority actions to be undertaken by various groups to implement the recommended actions and concepts in the adopted plan. The Strategic Initiatives allow for the recommended actions to be organized into manageable units of work and prioritized by timeframe, helping ensure implementation.

Several “Early Actions” were included in the list. These are actions that were underway prior to adoption of the RCP in July 2004, or were expected to be initiated immediately after adoption. All of the “Early Actions” identified have been initiated and include:

- Preparation of a Smart Growth Concept Map
- Development of a regional funding program for MOBILITY 2030 (TransNet)
- Evaluation of the use of transportation impact funding
- Adoption of updated Regional Housing Needs Assessment
- Development of a regional habitat funding program

Many other Strategic Initiatives are underway or are planned to be undertaken in this fiscal year. Further discussion on efforts underway is included in the conclusion of the various sections of this report.

**WHERE WE NEED TO IMPROVE**

As a region, we should provide enough homes to meet the demand created by projected job and population growth. The RCP recognizes that local land use plans, if left unchanged, do not provide enough capacity to meet the region’s projected housing needs over time. If housing capacities in key locations of our more urbanized areas are not increased, more San Diego workers will live in surrounding areas including Riverside and Imperial Counties and Baja California. The result for our region will be a continued housing crisis and worsening traffic. Furthermore, the RCP calls for the San Diego region to take more responsibility for its own housing needs and create additional housing and mixed use capacity in appropriate locations.

The major challenges before us are how to intelligently use the small amount of remaining undeveloped land designated for residential development, how to protect our natural
environment, how to maximize urban redevelopment and infill opportunities, and how to coordinate these revitalization efforts with our current and future transportation networks, maximizing mobility within our region.

From an economic perspective, the RCP calls for creating opportunities for an improving standard of living. This report indicates that while our workforce is increasingly well-educated, job growth in the region has been concentrated in low wage industries. And, overall, our region’s standard of living is growing very slowly and we have not made progress on reducing poverty.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

Based on the data collected for this Baseline Report, some highlights become apparent both positive and in areas where improvement is needed.

Moving in the right direction

• Nearly one-third of new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
• Ninety nine percent of new housing units built in the region in 2005 are located within the San Diego County Water Authority service area.
• Growth in transit ridership has outpaced population growth
• Crime has decreased
• Beach closures have declined
• Air quality has improved
• The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources has increased significantly

Areas for improvement

• The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem
• Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years as have total hours of delay per traveler
• Many waterbodies have some degree of impairment
• Several beaches are losing sand
• Job growth in the region has been concentrated in low-wage industries

Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle, though some will be more noticeable. This baseline report will serve as the benchmark for monitoring progress. If progress is not made over time, SANDAG, through its policy committees or the Board may wish to re-evaluate the strategies and actions recommended in the RCP.
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DEVELOPING INDICATORS

The set of performance indicators included in the RCP were discussed and developed by The SANDAG Regional Planning Committee and the Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. A primary prerequisite for all of the annual indicators was that they must be based on data that is available, consistent, and reliable. In addition, the groups clarified other characteristics for the indicators:

- **Regional**: The indicators are intended to focus on the region as a whole, not on individual jurisdictions or subregions.

- **Quality of Life**: The indicators are to be used for monitoring the region’s quality of life and are not intended to be used as the criteria for distributing incentives. Overall, the indicators are intended to answer the questions: “Is the RCP being implemented?” and “Is RCP implementation having a positive impact on the region?”

- **Flexibility**: Some of the indicators may evolve. As new technologies and data resources become available, the list of indicators could be updated and indicators that were once the best available could be replaced by better, more representative, or more informative indicators.

- **Annual and Periodic Indicators**: While it is the intent to update the indicators on an annual basis, the final project monitoring could include both a core group of annually-updated indicators and a set of periodic, more comprehensive indicators updated every three to five years. For example, specific habitat monitoring projects may only be feasible every few years, but would yield valuable information.

When the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in July 2004, a commitment was made to monitor our progress toward implementing the plan.

In addition to monitoring the RCP, SANDAG undertakes three other performance monitoring programs on a regular basis:

- The Regional Transportation Plan
- The State of the Commute
- The Sustainable Competitiveness Index
These programs are currently maintained independently, but work is underway to coordinate and integrate the four performance monitoring programs. Integration of the programs will result in greater consistency at a policy level, and improved efficiency of data collection at an administrative level.

In integrating the programs, the RCP will provide the overarching framework for all performance monitoring at SANDAG. All monitoring efforts would use RCP monitoring indicators to the extent possible.

Staff responsible for each monitoring program is currently working to refine and integrate the programs, streamline the indicators required by each program, and perhaps even collapse or combine some of the reports or the indicators included therein.

Table 1 presents the final set of annual indicators developed by the three groups and includes the addition of one new indicator (Balanced Job Growth). The indicators are grouped by RCP subject and goal category:

- Urban Form and Transportation
- Housing
- Healthy Environments – Natural Habitats, Water Quality, Shoreline Preservation, Air Quality
- Economic Prosperity
- Borders

**ESTABLISHING A BASELINE**

This report provides a baseline by which to measure future performance. The report features a discussion of the significance and initial findings from the data collected for each indicator. Data were not available for five indicators at the time this report was prepared: Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Transit Corridors; Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas; Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained; Lagoon Health; and Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade Program. However, data for these indicators is expected to be available in the next one to two years. Additionally, since the initial list of indicators was prepared, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, which will be part of future reporting for the Share of New Units by Structure Type and Income Category.

At the conclusion of each section of this report, there is a discussion of work efforts underway that may, over time, influence the outcome of the various indicators. For example, the Smart Growth Incentive Program is intended to increase the region’s share of housing and jobs in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas and to reduce pressure for development outside the San Diego County Water Authority Boundary.
Table 1
ANNUAL INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

1. URBAN FORM / TRANSPORTATION

1. Share of new units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary
3. Annual transit ridership
4. Commute mode shares (single occupancy vehicles, carpool, transit, walking, biking, etc.)
5. Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and key transit corridors
6. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
7. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler
8. Regional crime rates

2. HOUSING

1. Housing Affordability Index (compares median home ownership costs to median income)
2. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income
3. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units
4. Share of new and existing units by structure type (single family, multifamily) and income category
5. Vacancy rates
6. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions
7. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

3. HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas (acres and percent of preserve area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of preserve area actively maintained (removal of invasive species, trash removal, fence repairs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of beach closure days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impaired waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoreline Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Beach widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lagoon health (salinity, dissolved oxygen levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Air Quality Index (number of days &quot;unhealthy for sensitive groups&quot; with AQI &gt; 100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

1. Labor force educational attainment (Share of adult population with high school, college, and graduate education)
2. Balanced job growth
3. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters
4. Regional unemployment rate compared to state and nation
5. Real per capita income
6. Regional poverty rate compared to state and nation
5. PUBLIC FACILITIES

**Water Supply**
1. Water consumption
2. Diversity of water supply (share of regional water supply, by source)
3. Recycled water use

**Energy**
4. Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand
5. Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported
6. Share of energy produced from renewable resources

**Waste Management**
7. Percent of waste that is recycled
8. Landfill space available

6. BORDERS

1. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California
2. Border wait times for personal trips and goods movement
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, pedestrian commuter program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program

SETTING TARGETS

Specific targets to be used as part of the performance measures have been identified for four indicators: Beach Widths, Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand, Share of Energy Produced in the Region vs. Imported, and Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources. All four of these targets are either included in existing legislation or adopted SANDAG policies and were reviewed with the Regional Planning Committee in December 2005.

Setting targets for the other indicators will be done with the Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group over the next year. Where possible, both a short-range target—possibly five years—and a year 2030 target will be developed for each indicator.

By establishing a comprehensive set of performance indicators, we can begin to measure our success as we realize the goals of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

COMPILING THE REPORT

In preparing this report, SANDAG coordinated with technical staff from other agencies to verify the accuracy of data and analysis. The report was presented to the Regional Planning Stakeholders and Technical Working Groups, and released for a 60-day public comment period, prior to acceptance by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 27, 2006. Where possible, changes were made to the report, largely for clarification and further explanation.
URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION
INTRODUCTION

The form of future development is a critical component of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Central among the plan’s core values is creating attractive, sustainable communities within the region’s existing urbanized areas. Urban design matters at a regional scale and at a personal scale. Our land use and design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. That’s why the RCP encourages urban development with an appropriate mix of uses designed to create safe and healthy communities. In addition, the relationship between regional transportation plans and local land use plans and policies is crucial in ensuring that the region’s transportation system efficiently connects our communities.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goals included in the RCP:

- Focus future population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities to preserve open space and to make more efficient use of existing urban infrastructure
- Create safe, healthy, walkable, and vibrant communities that are designed and built accessible to people of all abilities
- Integrate the development of land use and transportation, recognizing their interdependence
- Develop a flexible, sustainable, and well-integrated transportation system that focuses on moving people and goods – not just vehicles

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above urban form and transportation goals are as follows:

1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
2. Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary
3. Annual Transit Ridership
4. Commute Mode Shares
5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors (future indicator)
6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network
7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler
8. Regional Crime Rate
1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to balance regional population, housing, and employment growth with habitat preservation, agriculture, open space, and infrastructure needs. The RCP further calls for improving connections between land use and transportation plans through incentives and collaboration. The identification of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas – places that accommodate, or have the potential to accommodate, higher residential and/or employment densities near public transit – will provide a basis for directing transportation improvements, other public facility investments, and incentives through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

In collaboration with all member agencies, a Draft Smart Growth Concept Map has been prepared and was accepted by the Board of Directors for planning purposes in June 2006. The Concept Map includes nearly 200 existing, planned, or potential smart growth areas that have been recommended by each of the region’s 18 cities and the County.

Over time, the number of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas will serve as an indicator of the region’s success in collaborating with and creating incentives for development in smart growth areas and reducing pressure to develop in the region’s backcountry. The data below represent new units in those Smart Growth Opportunity Areas that have been identified as “Existing/Planned.”

Findings

The smart growth areas identified on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map currently include 162,132 housing units and 368,162 jobs. In total, nearly 15 percent of all the housing units in the region and 25 percent of all the jobs are located within the “Existing/Planned” areas. In 2005, new housing units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas comprised nearly 33 percent of all new housing units in the region. This represents an increase over the previous year.

Increases in density in the region’s Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, as compared to density in the region as a whole, can also signify success in incentivizing development in smart growth areas. Currently, such data is only available for 2004, but the increases can be monitored over time. In 2004, net residential density in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas totaled 26.6 dwelling units per residential acre, as compared to 3.5 dwelling units per acre in the region at large. Employment density in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas totaled 55.8 jobs per employment acre, as compared to 28.9 jobs per acre in the region at large.
Table 2
TOTAL HOUSING UNITS AND JOBS COMPARED TO HOUSING AND JOBS IN EXISTING AND PLANNED SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Housing Units in Smart Growth Areas</th>
<th>Total Jobs</th>
<th>Jobs in Smart Growth Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,095,077</td>
<td>157,725</td>
<td>1,449,349</td>
<td>368,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>162,132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.

Figure 1
NEW HOUSING UNITS IN SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS COMPARED TO NEW HOUSING UNITS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.
2. Share of New Housing Units within County Water Authority Service Boundary

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to limit sprawl, especially into the backcountry. Specifically, the RCP recommends that the region focus future population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities. The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) service boundary serves as a useful distinction between existing urban/suburban areas and the backcountry.

Findings

Since the year 2000, approximately 99 percent of the region’s new housing units were constructed within the Water Authority service boundary.
3. Annual Transit Ridership

Significance

The RCP sets out an objective of developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that is competitive with the cost and time of driving alone, especially during peak periods. Annual transit ridership will increase if this goal is met, and transit should, over time, play an increased role in addressing regional mobility needs. Increases in transit opportunities and transit use provide citizens with more transportation choices and greater mobility. The following data examine annual ridership trends between 1996 and 2005 as compared with growth rates in population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Findings

The trend in annual transit ridership since 1968 has been increasing. Between 1996 and 2005, annual transit ridership in the San Diego region increased from 74 million riders to nearly 88 million riders, representing an increase of 17 percent. While ridership declined somewhat between 2001 and 2004, the year 2005 reflects the first increase in ridership since 2001, suggesting that this trend may be reversing itself.

The growth in transit ridership outpaced growth in population; demonstrating that the role of transit in serving regional mobility needs has increased. This role may increase further in the future for several reasons:
- The recent opening of the new Green Line trolley
- The future opening of the SPRINTER rail line
- System structural changes being made by both the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District
- The increased attractiveness of transit in light of higher fuel prices
- The increased funding for transit over the long-term given the recent extension of the TransNet program, which will allow for significant capital infrastructure improvements for rail and bus services, and operating funds for new and expanded services, including Bus Rapid Transit

Figure 4
SAN DIEGO REGION ANNUAL TRANSIT BOARDINGS (1968-2004)

Source: Annual Boardings Data, Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District.
### Figure 5
GROWTH IN TRANSIT RIDERSHIP COMPARED TO VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED AND POPULATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (1996-2003)

![Bar chart showing growth in transit ridership, vehicle miles traveled, and population from 1996 to 2003.](chart.png)

Sources: Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, SANDAG.

### Table 3
GROWTH IN TRANSIT RIDERSHIP COMPARED TO GROWTH IN POPULATION AND VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (1996-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Transit Ridership</th>
<th>Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>74,679,000</td>
<td>65,532,000</td>
<td>2,621,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>78,047,377</td>
<td>67,354,000</td>
<td>2,653,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>86,446,912</td>
<td>69,665,000</td>
<td>2,702,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>90,582,180</td>
<td>71,984,000</td>
<td>2,751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96,024,045</td>
<td>73,632,000</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>95,128,745</td>
<td>75,795,000</td>
<td>2,863,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>89,953,608</td>
<td>78,117,000</td>
<td>2,920,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>87,224,915</td>
<td>79,442,000</td>
<td>2,971,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>85,902,494</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,013,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87,770,419</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,051,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change 1996-2003: +25,144,579  +13,910,000  +350,705

Percent Change 1996-2003: +17%  +21%  +13%

Sources: Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, SANDAG.
4. Commute Mode Shares

Significance

Transportation goals in the RCP include providing a wide range of convenient, efficient, and safe travel choices, and reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials. Commute modes other than single-occupant private vehicles help reduce traffic congestion and air pollution and improve the efficiency of the transportation system by maximizing the person carrying capacity. Thus, commute mode shares are used as an indicator of success in providing a wide range of travel choices and reducing congestion.

Commute mode share data are currently unavailable at the corridor level on an annual basis, although this is expected to change. (See SANDAG Role discussion at the end of this Section.) However, regional data on mode share is available each year from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS).

Findings

In terms of the commute to work, recent Census data for the 2004-2005 period\(^1\) shows that the automobile continues to be the primary mode of travel in the region for about 89 percent of the home-to-work trips being made. It should be noted that this figure represents a typical means of travel to work and does not reflect activities such as carpooling or riding transit only once a week or occasionally. It should also be noted that the sample does not include people who live in group quarters, such as college dormitories, military quarters, and group homes. Such populations are presumably more likely to use transit or modes other than driving alone, so their exclusion from the survey may mean that the commute mode shares for transit (about 4%), walking (1.3%), and other means, such as bicycling (1.8%) may be understated. 4.2% worked at home.

The other consideration is that these figures only provide a general indication of how people are getting to work on a region-wide basis and do not reflect the effect transit has on commute travel in specific corridors where transit investments have been focused. There are significant differences in commute behavior between communities within the San Diego region. The role of transit is maximized in areas that have transit-supportive land use densities and urban design. For example, Downtown San Diego and City Heights in the Mid-City area are two areas that are well-served by transit. Accordingly, the 2000 Census found that they have transit commute mode shares of 20 percent and 11 percent, respectively. Conversely, areas that are not transit-supportive from a land use standpoint, such as Spring Valley or San Marcos, generate just a two percent transit commute mode share.

\(^1\) American Community Survey, U.S Census Bureau
5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors

Significance and Future Reporting

The RCP includes the goals of reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials, and developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that are competitive with the time to drive alone during peak periods. Progress toward these goals can be measured by evaluating travel times and volumes for key auto and transit corridors.

Travel time and volume data on freeways will be provided by the Performance Measurement System (PeMS), a Web based system used for reporting and monitoring the performance of the freeway system. Freeway detector stations produce volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds. Once data is aggregated for each detector station, PeMS can apply algorithms to estimate a number of performance indicators.

The quality of transit related data for this indicator available at this time is somewhat limited. However, data sources for future monitoring reports are being investigated. Currently, travel time is available from transit schedules. Transit volume data are currently available from the SANDAG Regional Passenger Counting Program where transit ridership volumes are estimated for each transit route once a year. These data sources will likely be used in the near-term until a more sophisticated approach can be implemented.
6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network

Significance

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) network is a subset of the region’s most heavily used arterial roadways and freeways, as shown in Map 1 (2006 CMP Roadway Network map). The roads on the network are regularly monitored and rated to determine their Level of Service (LOS). Roadway LOS is a measure used to evaluate how well a roadway section or intersection operates. LOS is commonly described in letter form, ranging from LOS A (least congested) to LOS F (most congested). Peak hour levels of service in 2005 for all roads on the network are shown on Map 2 (2005 Peak Hour LOS map). Congested roadways and freeways (those designated with LOS F) are considered “deficient.” The number of miles of deficient roads are key indicators to monitor the success of implementing MOBILITY 2030, the transportation component of the RCP. As traffic worsens, the number of deficient miles increases.

Findings

When compared to prior years, congestion has stabilized on the region’s freeways and conventional highways. Congestion fluctuated on the region’s arterials between 2001 and 2005. Between 2001 and 2003, the number of deficient miles on the region’s highways decreased slightly and remained the same in 2005. But the number of deficient miles increased considerably on arterials between 2001 and 2003, then decreased somewhat in 2005. Freeways also showed a slight increase in the number of deficient miles, followed by stabilization in 2005.

---

2 Arterials, Freeways, Highways Defined:
Principal Arterials – Signalized streets that serve primarily through traffic and provide access to abutting properties as a secondary function. For example, Balboa Avenue from I-5 to I-15.
Freeways – Multilane divided roadways grade separated from other roadways, with full control access and egress. For example, Interstate 5.
Highways – State or federally-designated urban or rural routes, designed to accommodate longer trips in the region. For example, State Route 75.
Figure 6

Table 4

Percent Deficient Roads
Percent deficient is calculated from Miles Deficient and Total Miles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Deficient Roads</th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miles of Deficient Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles of Deficient Roads</th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miles of Total Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles of Total Roads</th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler

Significance

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler is a key indicator for monitoring the success of implementing MOBILITY 2030, the transportation component of the RCP. Whereas average travel time during the peak period is a good measure of performance in individual corridors, annual hours of delay is a better overall regional indicator of the time residents spend in traffic each year – increased time spent in traffic typically corresponds to decreases in residents’ productivity and quality of life, and an increase in air pollution. As traffic worsens, annual hours of delay increases.

This indicator could be viewed as not simply an indicator of congestion. The findings could also reflect the region’s land use decisions regarding the location of jobs, housing, and retail establishments, as well as residents’ choices regarding where to live, where to work, and where to shop. Presumably as smart growth is implemented, such decisions can help to reduce annual hours of traffic delay experienced by the region’s residents.

Findings

The region’s residents are spending an increasing amount of time in traffic. Annual hours of traffic delay represents the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion. Between 1996 and 2003, the region experienced a 79 percent increase in the average hours of traffic delay per traveler during peak periods.

Delay continues to grow as annual vehicle miles of travel (VMT) outpaces the growth in population, employment, and new highway miles. Major highway improvements that may have contributed to the slower growth of traffic delay in the years 1997 and 1999-2001 include the State Route 76 expressway in Oceanside, portions of State Route 125 north of Interstate 8, and State Route 15 south of Interstate 8. The recent completion of the Green Line trolley extension to San Diego State University, along with projects underway at the I-5/I-805/SR 56 interchange and in the I-15 may help to curb the upward trend in regional traffic delay.3

---

3 Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per traveler: To calculate “Annual Hours of Delay,” Texas Transportation Institute estimates the daily vehicle hours delay per incident (delays that result from accidents or broken down vehicles) and recurring (predictable) conditions for both freeways and principal arterials. This is then multiplied by a factor of 250 (represents working days per year) and 1.25 (represents average persons per vehicle).
Figure 7
ANNUAL HOURS OF TRAFFIC DELAY PER TRAVELER DURING PEAK PERIODS (1996-2003)

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Study, Texas Transportation Institute.

Table 5
ANNUAL HOURS OF TRAFFIC DELAY PER TRAVELER DURING PEAK PERIODS (1996-2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hours of Traffic Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Study, Texas Transportation Institute.

8. Regional Crime Rate

Significance

One goal of the RCP is to create safe, healthy, walkable, and vibrant communities. The regional crime rate, as measured by Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Index Crimes, is one way to measure safety. FBI Index Crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.
Findings

Crime in the region decreased significantly between 1995 and 1999, and has remained relatively constant since 1999. Some explanation for this trend can be found in the SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division April 2006 report entitled Twenty-Five Years of Crime in the San Diego Region: 1981 through 2005:

“A number of theories have been provided regarding possible factors related to this overall drop in crime, including declining numbers of young males in high crime-associated age groups, legislation which increased jail and prison time for violent offenses, economic factors, and the implementation of effective crime prevention programs.”

![Figure 8](image)

**URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY**

Conclusions

It is promising that one-third of the new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, and that 99 percent of the region’s housing stock is located within the Water Authority service area. Transit ridership has fluctuated, but the general trend over the last decade is upward. In some areas, as much as 20 percent of commute trips are made by transit. However, traffic congestion on most of our roads and freeways has increased over the last 10 years, as have total hours of travel delay. Crime has declined significantly.
Future Target Setting

Currently no targets have been set for this group of indicators. Targets may be developed in the future for some or all of the indicators as a result of discussions among local elected officials, stakeholders, and SANDAG staff. The Independent Transit Planning Review panel has recommended that commute mode share targets be set for defined corridors. SANDAG has identified a preliminary set of key transportation corridors that will be used to monitor mode share and other transportation related performance indicators.

SANDAG Role

As the region’s transportation planning agency, SANDAG plays many roles with regard to the regional transportation goals laid out in the RCP. Here is a list of some of the pertinent programs and projects. More detailed information is available from the SANDAG public information office and Web site.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will next be updated in 2007. One of the purposes of the RTP is to better connect our freeway, transit, and road networks to our homes, schools, work, shopping, and other activities. The 2007 Regional Transportation Plan will build upon MOBILITY 2030, the RTP adopted in 2003, as well as the 2006 RTP Update and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. The 2007 RTP will continue to strengthen the land use transportation connection and offer regional transportation funding incentives to jurisdictions that support smarter, more sustainable land use.

As an input to the 2007 RTP, an Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) was designed to provide an independent assessment of the transit plan contained in the 2030 Mobility Plan. A peer review panel, made up of transit planning, transit operations, and land use experts from around North America, helped guide the study process and work of a technical consultant. In addition to providing recommendations on the transit plan and project corridors, they also discussed the need for increased coordination of SANDAG Smart Growth initiatives and overall RCP goals with transportation planning. Recommendations contained in the final report prepared by the peer review panel and consultant will serve as input into the 2007 comprehensive update of the RTP.

Smart Growth Concept Map

The draft Smart Growth Concept Map lays out almost 200 existing, planned, or potential smart growth locations that have been identified by the 18 cities and the County of San Diego as Smart Growth Opportunity Areas. The Map will provide a framework for such programs as the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, and recommendations that will be included in the 2007 RTP. The final map will be approved in 2007.
**Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program**

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program awarded $19 million of federal Transportation Enhancement funds to projects throughout the region that integrate smart growth land uses and transportation facilities. Lessons learned from the Pilot Program will guide the design of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, which will fund $7 million in projects each year beginning in 2009.

**Urban Design Guidelines**

SANDAG is preparing Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines that will provide guidance to local governments, planners, developers, community members, and others in defining smart growth development principles.

**Congestion Management Program**

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) provides innovative options for managing our region’s traffic congestion now and into the future. The CMP addresses both current and future congestion, giving jurisdictions options for implementing innovative and preventive congestion management strategies. The CMP addresses congestion through monitoring of our region’s roadway system, evaluation and mitigation of the impacts of new major developments on the CMP system, Deficiency Plans that include recommendations for improving a roadway’s performance, and alternative strategies such as better project design to encourage transit use and walking, or the establishment of carpool or vanpool programs, among others. The CMP also recommends programs to encourage bicycling and walking through Ridelink.

**Other Projects and Programs**

SANDAG also oversees the planning and development of key transportation projects and programs that may impact mode share, travel times, and traffic congestion over time. Some examples are:

- The Interstate15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit will create a 20-mile Managed Lanes facility in the median of Interstate 15 between State Route 163 and State Route 78 designed to provide priority access for transit, carpooling, and FasTrak.

- The Mid-Coast Transit Corridor project will connect with trolley service from the Old Town Transit Center to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre areas.

- The 22-mile Sprinter rail project will link the downtown areas of four rapidly growing North County cities: Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido.

- Evaluating the use of freeway shoulder lanes for buses in times of congestion based upon what is learned in the one-year demonstration project that allow buses on MTS Route 960
to use the freeway shoulder from Interstate 805 and Nobel Drive to State Route 52 and Kearny Villa Road during morning and evening rush hours.

- Ridelink coordinates a number of free commuter services to San Diego region residents to promote alternatives to driving alone to work or school.

- Implementing selected recommendations from the Independent Transit Planning Review including evaluating alternative approaches for monitoring the transit mode share in key transportation corridors to accurately measure return on transit investments.

- $19 million in TransNet funding has been allocated towards Regional Bicycle Projects and Walkable Communities. Projects are ongoing to provide access to transit, build additional bikeways, and expand the entire network for safe and convenient bicycle travel. Making the streets more pedestrian-friendly is another SANDAG goal, which the Walkable Communities program seeks to achieve. This demonstration program will show how walkable communities benefit neighborhoods, increase pedestrian safety, and contribute to smart growth planning.
HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

Affordable housing is typically defined as housing for which the resident pays no more than 30 percent of their income toward housing costs. The lack of affordable housing is one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. Housing can provide stability to our neighborhoods, communities, and families. It is vital to our economy. It is directly linked to traffic congestion, the length of our commutes, and the quality of our environment. Unfortunately, the costs of renting or owning a home in the San Diego region have risen dramatically over the past ten years. In fact, our region is regularly ranked as one of the top ten areas in the nation with the highest priced and least affordable housing.

A core value of the Regional Comprehensive Plan is to provide more housing choices—more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges. How much housing we build, what type of housing we build, and where we build it are some of the most important decisions we can make in shaping our region’s future.

While the types of homes vary, the majority (61 percent) of the housing units in the San Diego region are single family homes. Multifamily homes make up 35 percent of the region’s housing stock, and mobile homes, manufactured homes, and trailers comprise the remaining four percent.

The cost of homes in the region has increased dramatically over the last decade, especially when compared to household income, which has increased only slightly over the past 20 years. As of December 2005, only nine percent of households in the San Diego region could afford a median priced home, compared to 14 percent in California and 49 percent for the nation.4

Rental housing costs also are high. In an annual survey of rental costs entitled “Out of Reach,” the National Low Income Housing Coalition ranked the San Diego region as the 11th costliest rental housing market in the United States—up from 12th the year before. In 1999, the region ranked 40th.

To find affordable housing, many workers are moving far from their jobs, often outside San Diego County or across the international border. A recent survey indicates that 29,000 south western Riverside County residents commute into San Diego County for work, and workers even move as far away as Imperial County to find homes they can afford. An estimated 40,000 workers cross the border from Mexico each day for jobs in the San Diego region and many are U.S. citizens (Caltrans Traffic Census). This imbalance between jobs and housing is leading to a tremendous strain on our roads, freeways, infrastructure, and environment, as well as a strain on the quality of life for those commuters.

4 Source: California Association of Realtors, Housing Affordability Index, December 2005
The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels and abilities throughout the region

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above housing goal are as follows:

1. Housing Affordability Index
2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 percent of Income
3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units
4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category
5. Vacancy Rates
6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions
7. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

1. Housing Affordability Index

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of affordable housing choices for people of all income levels. The Housing Affordability Index rates the affordability of owner-occupied units currently on the market. The Index compares local median housing prices (including mortgage payments, interest rates, taxes, and insurance) with local household incomes to determine overall affordability. The Index shows the percentage of households that can afford a median priced home in the county. Lower index values represent less housing affordability. The Index ranges from zero (no household can afford a median priced home) to 100 (every household can afford a median priced home).
Findings

Housing affordability in the region has decreased significantly since 1995.

Figure 9

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY INDEX (1995-2005)

Table 6

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY INDEX (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of Households that can Afford a Median Priced Home in San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Association of Realtors.
2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 Percent of Income

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of affordable housing choices for people of all income levels. In addition to the Housing Affordability Index, which relates to owner-occupied housing, it is important to look at the full spectrum of housing options. To do this, the federal affordability standard is applied. Federal guidelines suggest that no household should spend more than one-third of its income on housing, for either rental or owner-occupied housing. Households spending more than one-third of their income on housing are considered to be living in unaffordable housing. The values listed below represent the percent of households that are paying 35 percent or more of their income for housing. This includes households with a mortgage, households without a mortgage, and renter-occupied units.

Findings

Housing affordability has declined in the region since 2000, as more households are paying 35 percent or more of their income for housing. These observed year-to-year increases are significant, and are not the result of sampling variability, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Figure 10
PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS PAYING 35 PERCENT OR MORE OF INCOME FOR HOUSING (2000-2004)

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.
3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units

Significance

A balance of jobs and housing is fundamental to many of the goals and objectives of the RCP. In particular, the RCP focuses on providing an adequate supply of housing for our region’s workforce and adequate sites to accommodate business expansion and retention. The ratio of new jobs to new housing units provides an indicator of whether or not the region is meeting both goals and is a calculated variable based on housing unit and wage and salary job counts.

Findings

Since 2001, we have seen steady growth in the number of new housing units completed, while job growth has fluctuated as a result of the nationwide recession.

However, even if the region is closer to establishing a favorable jobs-housing balance, it should be noted that the quality of job growth and the cost of housing still continue to impact quality of life in the region. The number of low-paying jobs in the region appears to be growing, as housing costs continue to increase. See the Balanced Job Growth indicator, in the Economic Prosperity chapter of this report.

Figure 11
TOTAL NEW JOBS PER NEW HOUSING UNIT RATIO (2001-2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Employment Development Department.
Table 7
TOTAL JOBS PER HOUSING UNIT RATIO (2001-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>New Jobs</th>
<th>New Jobs / New Units</th>
<th>Jobs / Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,193,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,048,699</td>
<td>1,218,400</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,063,371</td>
<td>1,230,700</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,078,416</td>
<td>1,240,100</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,095,077</td>
<td>1,258,600</td>
<td>16,661</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>1,281,000</td>
<td>13,423</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Employment Development Department.

4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of housing choices for people of all ages and income levels. The mix of single family and multifamily units is an indicator of the types of housing choices available to the region’s residents. Single family units may be either detached or attached units. Multifamily units include apartment buildings. Condominiums may fall into either category, depending on the configuration of the building. Note: Data on new and existing units by income category are not currently available, but should be included in future reports. Additionally, as stipulated in the SANDAG Board Policy No.033, jurisdictions are asked to report annually on their progress toward meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment for 2005-2010.

Findings

The mix of single and multifamily units in the region has remained constant over time. New construction may show some variation from year to year, but the overall trend has been a mix of roughly 1/3 multifamily and 2/3 single family units.
Figure 12
SHARE OF EXISTING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE (2000-2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates

Figure 13
NEW MULTIFAMILY AND SINGLE FAMILY UNITS (2001-2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates
5. Vacancy Rates

Significance

Housing vacancy rates are indicative of the supply of housing in the region. Low vacancy rates suggest a tight housing supply, and can lead to an increase in housing costs.

Findings

Rental vacancy rates have remained relatively constant since 2000. Owner-occupancy vacancy rates have increased slightly since 2000. In both cases, minor year-to-year fluctuations in the reported data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

![Figure 14: Vacancy Rates by Ownership (2000-2004)](image)

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

Significance

Overcrowding is an indicator of both the supply and affordability of housing. Overcrowded housing suggests that residents either cannot find, or cannot afford, adequate housing. Federal guidelines suggest that a household is overcrowded if there is more than one person per room in the housing unit.
Findings

Overcrowding in the region has remained relatively constant since 2000. Minor year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences.

Figure 15

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

7. Number of Household on the Waiting List for Section 8 (Housing Assistance) Vouchers

Significance

Tens of thousands of families and individuals in San Diego earn less than half of the median area income. They include seniors living on low fixed incomes, veterans who served the country but cannot afford decent homes, single-parent and even two-parent families in low-wage jobs, and people with disabilities.

To assist with rental costs, various housing authorities manage major programs to help house San Diegans. These programs make housing more affordable by reducing a family's rent amount. One such program is Section 8, which was enacted as part of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The Section 8 rental assistance programs are federally funded and administered through various housing agencies.
Findings

There are six housing authorities that administer the Section 8 program in the San Diego region; these agencies include the San Diego Housing Commission, the San Diego County Housing Authority, and the cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, and Oceanside. According to staff at these agencies, approximately 73,500 households are on Section 8 waiting lists with a wait time that ranges from four to seven years.

HOUSING SUMMARY

Conclusions

The region continues to experience serious housing affordability problems. The clearest evidence of this is the affordability ranking by the California Association of Realtors (CAR) Housing Affordability Index, which indicates that only 9 percent of the county's households can afford a median priced home, down from 38 percent in 1995. Further evidence of the region's growing unaffordability is the rising percentage—from 29 percent in 2000 to 36 percent in 2005—of households that pay more than 35 percent of their income for housing. Contributing to the increase in housing costs is the region's lack of housing supply and variety of housing types as shown in the ratio of new jobs to housing units and the share of existing units by structure type.

During the 1999-2004 housing element cycle the number of new homes built for very low and low income households in the region was about 5,800 units or about 16 percent of the new housing needed as identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. (See the Regional Housing Needs Assessment discussion below.)

Although home sales and home prices in San Diego have experienced historically high rates of growth since approximately 2000, rising interest rates and the increasing stock of resale homes indicate that San Diego's housing market is starting to plateau. In recent years, the rapid appreciation of existing housing stock combined with increased utilization of interest-only and no-interest loans enabled home sales and home prices to continue increasing. Despite the slowdown in the growth of home sales and home prices, the region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem.

Future Target Setting

The initial housing-related targets for the RCP will come from the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process described below. Over the next year, work will continue on setting targets for the other housing indicators.

SANDAG Role

SANDAG has a number of roles in helping the region address its housing needs and the goals laid out in the RCP. These roles include: undertaking the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
process associated with the preparation of local general plan housing elements, staffing the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG), reviewing state and federal housing-related legislation, and working with local jurisdictions on implementing smart growth.

**Regional Housing Needs Assessment**

The role of SANDAG in the local general plan housing element process is the preparation of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). SANDAG and the California Department of Housing and Community Development determine each region’s share of the state’s housing need for the five-year housing element cycle based on growth projections. This number represents the amount of new housing units for which the region will need to plan during the housing element cycle. Then SANDAG works with the local jurisdictions to allocate overall regional housing needs to each jurisdiction in four required income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate).

The RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle was adopted by the Board of Directors on February 25, 2005. The goals set as part of this process will help the region plan for more housing and a greater diversity of housing types. Monitoring the region’s actual production of housing against the RHNA goals will help the region determine its success in meeting its housing needs. SANDAG Board Policy No. 33 lays out specific provisions regarding the allocation of certain discretionary funding to local jurisdictions in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance.

**Regional Housing Working Group**

The Regional Housing Working Group is a standing committee that advises SANDAG on housing issues, including housing production, affordable housing, housing elements implementation, and the RHNA. The committee is composed of local housing staff and the representatives from the construction, financial, and real estate industries, low-income housing advocacy groups, and nonprofit organizations.
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

To ensure a healthy environment, the region must protect key open spaces and sensitive habitat areas, ensure that the air and water are clean, and restore eroding beaches. Also important to our healthy environment is urban ecology: those natural areas that remain in or around urbanized areas.

A number of issues must be addressed in order to implement a comprehensive, regional habitat preservation system to sustain natural features in urbanized areas of the region. While preserve areas provide habitat for threatened and endangered species, urban canyons and natural landscapes outside preserve areas also are important. They provide visual relief from urbanization as well as public access to the region’s natural resources.

Viable natural habitats, water quality, a well-managed shoreline, and air quality are critical components to the overall economic prosperity of our region. Also, they are critical to the health and well being of our residents.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following policy objectives included in the RCP:

NATURAL HABITATS
- Preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region
- Protect agricultural lands for future crop production and for functions described in habitat conservation plans

WATER QUALITY
- Restore, protect, and enhance the water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, inland surface waters, groundwaters, and wetlands
- Reduce or eliminate pollutants at their source before they enter our region’s water bodies

SHORELINE PRESERVATION
- Preserve and enhance the region’s beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources

AIR QUALITY
- Achieve and maintain federal and state clean air standards
The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above healthy environment policy objectives are as follows:

**NATURAL HABITATS**
1. Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas (future indicator)
2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained (future indicator)

**WATER QUALITY**
3. Number of Beach Closure Days
4. Impaired Waterbodies (miles or acres) Based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) Criteria

**SHORELINE PRESERVATION**
5. Beach Widths
6. Lagoon Health (future indicator)

**AIR QUALITY**
7. Air Quality Index

### 1. Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

#### Significance and Future Reporting

The RCP aims to preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region. The number of acres of sensitive habitat conserved (as denoted by “designated preserve areas”) indicates how well the region is doing at protecting native ecosystems.

There are a total of four habitat conservation planning programs in the San Diego region as shown in Map 3. Of these, plans have been completed for the MSCP South County Subregion and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP). The MSCP for the North County and East County Subareas are underway.

When the plans are completed, local jurisdictions are required to prepare annual habitat tracking reports that show how and where lands are being conserved, how well their conservation goals are being achieved, and how the habitat preserve system is being built out. A Regional Conserved Lands Database is being constructed which will allow the region to have a more complete accounting of conserved lands. The database will not limit itself to only those jurisdictions that prepare annual habitat tracking reports.

#### Findings

Since 1997, when the MHCP and the South County MSCP and were adopted, over 30,000 acres of land have been conserved in the City of San Diego and the unincorporated areas of the South County MSCP.
2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained

Significance and Future Reporting

The RCP recognizes that just preserving open space and habitats is not enough to maintain the biological value of the land, particularly in the urbanized western portion of the region where conserved areas are in close proximity to developed/urban areas. Similar to other infrastructure in the region, such as roads, transit systems, and water and sewer conveyance systems, natural habitat areas must be actively maintained to support the species and their habitats in perpetuity. This can be accomplished through adaptive land management activities and ongoing biological monitoring.

The responsibility to manage lands conserved to protect biological resources is that of the individual owner of the land – a government agency, a non-profit organization such as a land conservancy, a homeowner association, or an individual. There is currently no centralized strategy for preserve implementation; therefore there is no centralized data source from which to obtain data on land management activities.
SANDAG’s Environmental Mitigation Program has identified the need to establish an implementing structure to perform the functions of regional coordination. For example, with a coordinating structure in place, preserve data would be available to comprehensively track preserve build-out progress, including the percentage of the preserve being managed.

The first step of regional coordination is underway with the Regional Conserved Lands Database slated for completion in the summer of 2007. This database will provide general information on the status of land management activities for conserved areas. The database may also assist in identifying land areas in need of funds for land management activities. If a regional coordinating structure is developed, then activities pertaining to the preserve – land acquisition, habitat management, and biological monitoring, can be readily determined.

3. Number of Beach Closure Days

Significance

For environmental, economic, and recreational reasons, a goal of the RCP is to reduce or eliminate pollutants in our region’s water bodies. Beach closures pinpoint specific instances in which pollutants affect water quality in our ocean and bays. Fewer beach closures mean less pollution. It is necessary that beach closure days be examined with regard to the amount of rainfall each year, as this amount influences the number of beach closure days. The following data signify the number of days in the year during which the region experienced at least one beach closure, adjusted by inches of rainfall measured at Lindbergh Field.

Findings

The number of weather-adjusted beach closure days in the region has been decreasing over time. Beach closures within the region are largely attributed to pollution in urban runoff that is transported to rivers, bays, and ultimately the ocean via the stormwater conveyance system. To reduce pollution in urban runoff, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has issued a permit to local jurisdictions requiring them to develop and implement water quality programs that address this issue. The decrease in beach closures may be the result of the region’s jurisdictions working together to address this issue since the issuance of the permit in 2001.

The reduction in the number of weather-adjusted beach closure days also may be attributed to stricter water quality regulations. Over the last several years, the RWQCB has increased its standards and requirements placed on local jurisdictions. Furthermore, over the last several years the RWQCB has been stricter in its enforcement.

Figure 16 and Table 8 show the steady reduction of beach closure days since 2000. Although during 2005 the region had its highest yearly rainfall in the five-year period analyzed for this report, the

---

5 Rainfall often results in beach closures due to elevated bacteria levels in ocean waters. Levels of bacteria rise significantly in ocean waters especially those adjacent to storm drains, creeks, and rivers during and after rainstorms. Elevated levels of bacteria may continue for a period of up to three days following rainstorms, depending upon the intensity of the rain and the volume of runoff.
weather-adjusted closures continued to decrease. Knowing that rainfall events have a large impact on beach closures, progress made by local jurisdictions in implementing stormwater programs now and in the future may lessen the correlation between rainfall and beach closures. Increases in rainfall events may not necessarily mean an increase in beach closure days.

However, as standards set by the RWQCB become stricter over the next several years, the local jurisdictions may find it more difficult to meet these requirements. Funding for local stormwater programs must increase as the demands placed on local jurisdictions increase, in order to meet the ultimate goal of zero weather-adjusted beach closure days per year.

**Figure 16**
WEATHER-ADJUSTED BEACH CLOSURE DAYS (2000-2005)

![Graph showing weather-adjusted beach closure days (2000-2005)]

Source: Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health; Western U.S. Historical Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center.

**Table 8**
WEATHER-ADJUSTED BEACH CLOSURE DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather-Adjusted Closures</th>
<th>Beach Closure Days</th>
<th>Rainfall (inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health; Western U.S. Historical Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center.
4. Impaired Waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) Criteria

Significance

The Federal Clean Water Act (Section 303(d)) mandates that states develop a list of segments of water that do not meet water quality standards, even after pollution control technology has been implemented for point sources of pollution. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) works with the regional water quality control boards and local jurisdictions to prepare this list. Local jurisdictions are required by law to establish action plans and rank the waters in order to move towards improvement of these segments.

For environmental, economic, and recreational reasons, a goal of the RCP is to reduce or eliminate pollutants in our region’s waterbodies. The list of 303(d) impaired waterbodies pinpoints specific instances in which pollutants affect water quality in our lakes, rivers, and streams. Fewer impairments mean less pollution.

Findings

As of 2002, there are 52 water segments in the San Diego region, such as streams, waterbodies, and the shoreline, that are considered impaired and do not meet water quality standards. As seen below, the data represents the 303(d) list prepared for 2002. Currently, the SWRCB is updating the 303(d) list for 2006 and collecting comments from local jurisdictions. The 303(d) list is usually updated every two years and as information becomes available, the data will be included in future RCP performance monitoring reports.
Map 4
SAN DIEGO REGION 303(d) IMPAIRED WATERS
5. Beach Widths

Significance

The beaches of the San Diego region are an important environmental, economic, and recreational resource. The shoreline is an erosional coast, consisting primarily of narrow beaches backed by steep sea cliffs. The beaches and cliffs have been eroded for thousands of years by ocean waves and rising sea levels. Episodic and site-specific coastal retreat, such as bluff collapse, is inevitable, although some coastal areas have remained stable for many years.

In recent times, this erosion has been accelerated by urban development. The natural supply of sand to the region’s beaches has been significantly diminished by flood control structures, dams, water quality control devices, removal of sand and gravel through extraction operations, and the creation of impervious surfaces. With more development, the region’s beaches will continue to suffer increased erosion, thereby reducing, and possibly eliminating their physical and economic benefits.

Preserving the region’s beaches is a key policy objective of the RCP. The average beach widths representing all segments along the San Diego coastline are in Table 9.

Targets

Targets for individual shoreline segments were set in the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy in 1993. These targets are listed in Table 9, and are designated as the estimated total need for design property protection in the Strategy. Four shoreline segments (Silver Strand State Beach, Coronado, Ocean Beach, and Pacific/Mission Beaches) exceeded the 2010 target in 2004. The remainder of the shoreline segments are short of their 2010 targets.

Findings

Beach widths in the region have been declining since the Regional Beach Sand Project in 2001.

The SANDAG Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program (Monitoring Program) was initiated in 1996. The Monitoring Program provides physical measurements of the region’s beaches and is essential to the design and evaluation of future efforts to replenish beaches and manage the region’s shoreline. Specifically, the Monitoring Program measures the changes in beach width over time, documents the benefits of sand replenishment projects, and helps to improve the design and effectiveness of beach fills.

Since the Monitoring Program was first implemented, there has been regular nourishment of our beaches through the dredging of harbors and lagoons and the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP), which nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001. Since the completion of the RBSP, little to no sand has been placed on area beaches, the impact of which has been the return to pre-RBSP sand levels.
As seen in Table 9, with the exception of a couple of segments, after the RBSP the beach widths slowly declined and the data for 2004 looks very similar to the pre-RBSP beach width data for 1998.

### Table 9
**BEACH WIDTHS AND TARGETS OF SHORELINE SEGMENTS, SAN DIEGO REGION (IN FEET) (1998-2004)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>758.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>278.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific/ Mission Beaches</td>
<td>217.3</td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>265.3</td>
<td>273.3</td>
<td>271.8</td>
<td>272.5</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>219.8</td>
<td>253.2</td>
<td>253.6</td>
<td>213.8</td>
<td>219.4</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>227.5</td>
<td>229.8</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>262.0</td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>258.8</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Lagoon Health

**Significance and Future Reporting**

The RCP sets out the following policy objectives regarding water quality: restoring, protecting, and enhancing the water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, inland surface waters, groundwater and wetlands; and reducing or eliminating pollutants at their source before they enter our region’s water bodies.

The Lagoon Health indicator tells us about the health of the lagoon itself. The Federal Clean Water Act mandates that local governments develop plans for attaining or maintaining water quality in water bodies, which include rivers, bays, estuaries, lagoons, and the ocean. The three indicators together (beach closures, impaired water bodies, and lagoon health) provide an overall picture of
the health of the region’s water bodies. Just as beaches and rivers perform an essential function in the region’s ecosystem, lagoons perform a valuable function as well.

Lagoons act as a filter that removes pollution from runoff; they are critical to the survival of various types of birds, fish, and other wildlife through their provision of diverse habitat types, and similar to beaches, lagoons can be used for recreation.

As part of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit issued in 2001, parties to the permit are required to monitor the health of a majority of the region’s lagoons. Starting in 2007, monitoring data collected regarding bacterial levels in the lagoons will be included in this report. Currently, the City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of this data. They are re-evaluating their methodology over the next year and plan to implement a new program with the issuance of the new San Diego RWQCB permit. Once this methodology is finalized, SANDAG will likely utilize this data for this indicator.

7. Air Quality Index

Significance

Air quality affects public health, productivity, and the environment. Thus, for environmental, economic, and equity reasons, a goal of the RCP is to achieve and maintain federal and state clean air standards. Air quality can be measured by the number of days that the region fails to meet clean air standards.

The Air Quality Index (AQI) can be used for reporting daily air quality. It tells us how clean or polluted the air is, and what associated health effects might be a concern. The AQI focuses on the health effects people may experience within a few hours or days after breathing polluted air. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) calculates the AQI for five major air pollutants regulated by the Clean Air Act: ground-level ozone, particle pollution (also known as particulate matter), carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide. For each of these pollutants, the EPA has established national air quality standards to protect public health. In the San Diego region, ground-level ozone and particulate matter pollutant levels are responsible for the majority of days during which the region experiences an AQI over 100.

An AQI value of 100 generally corresponds to the national air quality standard for the pollutant, which is the level US EPA has set to protect public health. AQI values below 100 are generally thought of as satisfactory. When AQI values are above 100, air quality is considered to be unhealthy - first for certain sensitive groups of people, then for everyone as AQI values get higher. Sensitive groups are defined as those “at greater risk than the general population from the toxic effects of a specific air pollutant,” such as older adults, children, or those with heart or lung disease.
Findings

Air quality in the region has improved significantly since the early 1990s, as evidenced by the decrease in the number of days during which air quality was deemed unhealthy for sensitive groups. Effective emission control efforts have resulted in cleaner vehicles, power plants, industries, and consumer products, as well as transportation plans that integrate transit and other alternatives to solo vehicle travel. Air quality improvements are expected to continue despite projected growth in population, employment, industrial activity, and vehicles miles traveled.

Figure 17
NUMBER OF DAYS AIR QUALITY WAS DEEMED UNHEALTHY FOR SENSITIVE GROUPS (1995-2005)

Source: San Diego Air Pollution Control District.

HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT SUMMARY

Conclusions

Some of the indicators for which data is currently available show a relatively positive picture. Beach closures have declined and air quality has improved. On the other hand, many of our waterbodies have some degree of impairment, and many of our beaches are losing sand. We are making progress in habitat conserved with designated preserve areas.

Future Target Setting

At this point only the Beach Widths indicator has official targets. These targets are for the year 2010 and were established in 1993 as a part of the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy. The
Shoreline Preservation Working Group, which developed the Strategy and targets, is still active and may wish to establish later-year targets.

As the habitat conservation plans are completed, targets will be established by default. For example, the target for the South County MSCP is to conserve a total of 172,000 acres in that planning area.

Another potential target for air quality can be derived from requirements embodied in the federal and state Clean Air Acts. The San Diego air basin is classified as a “serious” non-attainment area for 1-hour ozone under the state Clean Air Act. At the federal level, the San Diego region has been designated as non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. The California Air Resources Board, in cooperation with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District and SANDAG, is developing an attainment plan for 8-hour ozone to demonstrate how the region will attain required 8-hour ozone levels by the June 2009 attainment date.

Targets for the other indicators in this section may be set after discussions among local elected officials, stakeholders, and SANDAG staff.

**SANDAG Role**

**Habitat Conservation Planning**

The largest subregional plan, the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), spans eleven cities and a portion of unincorporated San Diego County in southwestern San Diego County. Approved in 1997, the plan targets more than 172,000 acres for conservation and protects 85 sensitive plants and animal species.

The Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) includes seven incorporated cities in northern San Diego County. This subregional plan, approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in March 2003, provides the guidelines for the preservation of a 20,000-acre preserve system and the protection of 61 plant and animal species.

**Environmental Mitigation Program**

A component of the TransNet Extension is the creation of an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which goes beyond traditional mitigation for regional and local transportation projects. While the EMP includes an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for regional and local transportation projects, it also includes additional funding for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities. The EMP will help implement the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP). Satisfying the mitigation requirements for priority projects will be addressed comprehensively rather than on a project-by-project basis in order to maximize early land acquisition opportunities.
The Environmental Mitigation Program will be a collaborative effort among SANDAG, the cities, the County, the wildlife agencies (California Fish and Game and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service), and other regulatory agencies (Coastal Commission, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, U.S Environmental Protection Agency, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board) as well as representatives of various stakeholder groups, including the environmental community and the science/technical community.

**Shoreline Preservation Working Group**

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was formed as a committee in the 1980s and currently advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted in 1993. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. It contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program and on financing and implementation. The Working Group has technical expertise and background knowledge of regional shoreline issues, which is useful in applying the principles and goals laid out in the Strategy and The Regional Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2004). Continuing to support the region’s ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts is a top priority for the Working Group. Additionally, in 1996, SANDAG enacted a shoreline monitoring program and the Working Group will continue to oversee and implement this program.

**MOBILITY 2030/Regional Transportation Improvement Conformity with the State Implementation Plan (Air quality)**

SANDAG and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) must make a determination that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) conform to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. Conformity to the SIP means that transportation activities will not create new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay the attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
INTRODUCTION

The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) was originally developed in 1998 in response to the economic restructuring and recession of the early 1990s. REPS laid out a concise strategy that called for infrastructure investment (both human and physical capital) and public policy support to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. The Prosperity Strategy is based upon the premise that investments in human and physical infrastructure will lead to stronger businesses and a well-trained workforce, ultimately leading to improvements in the regional standard of living.

IMPROVING THE REGION’S STANDARD OF LIVING

- Investments in human and physical infrastructure
- Businesses that add higher-paying jobs to region stay and expand
- Labor force has the incentive to seek training and education
- Higher paying jobs improve region’s standard of living

As a component of Regional Comprehensive Plan implementation, the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy is currently being updated to incorporate new data and to reflect economic
changes since the 1990s. The overall strategy, however, remains the same: invest in infrastructure to improve standard of living.

In light of the update it has become clear that some indicators may be better suited to tracking our progress than others. For instance, former studies have included indicators that focused on job growth in high-wage sectors of the economy. What is becoming apparent through the REPS update is that the balance of job growth is ultimately a more important metric for the region's economic prosperity. For that reason, a new job-balance indicator is being added to the RCP Monitoring report.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Ensure a rising standard of living for all of our residents

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above economic prosperity goal are as follow:

HUMAN CAPITAL
1. Labor Force Educational Attainment

JOBS BALANCE
2. Balanced Job Growth
3. Employment in High-Wage Clusters
4. Unemployment Rate

STANDARD OF LIVING
5. Real Per Capita Income
6. Regional Poverty Rate

1. Labor Force Educational Attainment

Significance

The RCP maintains that the region should offer broad access to education and workforce training opportunities to all residents, with an emphasis on the economically disadvantaged to foster shared economic prosperity. Educational opportunity assists in raising the standard of living for the region’s residents by providing people with the training to move up their career ladders.

Findings

Educational attainment in the region has increased somewhat since 2000.
2. Balanced Job Growth

Significance

The balance of job growth is important to the long-term economic health of the region. If job growth is concentrated in low-wage jobs, the standard of living will fall. Job growth can occur in those lower-wage industries, but must be balanced by growth in jobs higher on the career ladder to provide upward mobility and a rising standard of living for the region’s residents.

Findings

Since the 1990s employment in low-wage industries has grown faster than in middle- and high-wage industries. Between 1990 and 2004, the proportion of the labor force employed in low-wage industries increased by 3%. Average salaries in the lowest paying industries increased 9% between 1990 and 2004, while average salaries in the highest paying industries increased 33% in the same time period.
3. Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters

Significance

Economic clusters are groups of interrelated, export-oriented industries that are responsible for bringing new money into the region. Industries within a cluster have business transactions with one another, and thus are interdependent. Cluster companies often participate in local industry associations, which foster collaboration and the exchange of knowledge. Companies within a cluster also compete with each other for market share, which drives innovation and productivity.

Companies within clusters tend to be among the region’s leaders in research and development funding, patent awards, and other key indicators of innovation. Many of the clusters also pay high wages, although some do not. All clusters are economic drivers for the region because they are export-oriented. San Diego’s export-oriented clusters include the following:

- Biomedical Products
- Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals
- Communications
- Financial Services
- Fruit and Vegetables
- Horticulture
• Computer and Electronics
• Defense and Transportation Equipment
• Design
• Environmental Technology
• Entertainment and Amusement
• Publishing
• Recreational Goods
• Software
• Specialty Foods
• Travel and Hospitality

Of these clusters, twelve are considered to have high wages. High-wage clusters are clusters in which the average annual salary is above the regional average across all industries. Growth in high-wage economic clusters therefore has a dual benefit for the region: economic growth that brings money into the region and growth of high-paying jobs for local residents. These characteristics fit in with the RCP goals of improving the local business environment, and providing a rising standard of living to the region’s residents.


Findings

An economic slowdown at both the local and national levels caused employment in high wage clusters to dip by approximately 1,800 jobs between 2002 and 2003. Slight declines occurred in Biomedical Products, Communications, Computer and Electronics, Defense and Transportation Equipment, Publishing, Recreational Goods, and Software, which lost a combined total of 5,900 jobs. Meanwhile San Diego’s Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals, Design, Environmental Technology, and Financial Services clusters continued to grow, adding a total of 4,100 jobs to the regional economy.
4. Regional Unemployment Rate

Significance

The unemployment rate is an indicator of economic activity in the region. A low unemployment rate implies that the economy is strong and that most people who want a job can find one. These characteristics fit in with the RCP goals of improving the local business environment, and providing a rising standard of living for the region’s residents.

The unemployment rate is the proportion of persons in the labor force who do not currently have a job. The labor force is defined as persons age 16 and older who are either currently employed or unemployed but looking for a job. Persons who cannot work, or who choose not to work, are not included in the rate.

Findings

While the region’s unemployment rate increased slightly during the national recession at the beginning of the 1990s, San Diego has fared far better than the state or nation as a whole. Moreover, the region’s unemployment rate continues to remain at historically low levels, signifying a strong local economy.
Figure 21

UNEMPLOYMENT IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2005)

Table 10

UNEMPLOYMENT IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Real Per Capita Income

Significance

The primary, overarching goal of the Economic Prosperity chapter of the RCP is to ensure a rising standard of living for all residents. One common measure of standard of living is per capita income.

Per capita income is determined by dividing a region’s total personal income by the population of the region. Values are listed in inflation-adjusted 2004 dollars.

Findings

The region’s real per capita income rose steadily from 1995 to 2000, but has fallen slightly since. However, it continues to be higher than that of both the state and the nation.

Figure 22
REAL PER CAPITA INCOME IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2003) IN INFLATION-ADJUSTED 2004 DOLLARS

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis; SANDAG Annual Population & Housing Estimates; U.S. Census Bureau, Annual Population Estimates
Table 11
REAL PER CAPITA INCOME IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2003) IN INFLATION-ADJUSTED 2004 DOLLARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$32,061</td>
<td>$30,277</td>
<td>$28,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$31,412</td>
<td>$29,222</td>
<td>$27,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$31,517</td>
<td>$29,181</td>
<td>$28,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$31,308</td>
<td>$28,619</td>
<td>$27,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$31,248</td>
<td>$28,931</td>
<td>$28,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$31,938</td>
<td>$29,636</td>
<td>$28,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
<td>$30,436</td>
<td>$29,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$34,053</td>
<td>$31,177</td>
<td>$29,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$36,325</td>
<td>$32,742</td>
<td>$31,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$37,235</td>
<td>$33,439</td>
<td>$31,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$38,186</td>
<td>$35,612</td>
<td>$32,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$37,766</td>
<td>$35,068</td>
<td>$32,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$37,544</td>
<td>$34,448</td>
<td>$32,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$37,150</td>
<td>$34,278</td>
<td>$32,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Regional Poverty Rate

Significance

The primary, overarching goal of the Economic Prosperity chapter of the RCP is to ensure a rising standard of living for all residents. The poverty rate provides one measure to determine whether or not conditions are improving for the region’s lower-income residents.

These values represent the percentage of individuals whose total income falls below the poverty threshold set by the U.S Census Bureau, according to family size and composition. For example, for a family of four with two children under the age of 18, the poverty threshold equaled an annual household income of $19,157 in 2004.

Findings

Poverty in the region has remained relatively constant since 2000. Minor fluctuations in the reported data are likely the result of the survey techniques.
### Table 12
PERCENT OF RESIDENTS LIVING IN POVERTY IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (2000-2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U. S Census Bureau

---

**ECONOMIC PROSPERITY SUMMARY**

**Conclusions**

A few trends can be detected from the above data. The workforce in San Diego is increasingly well-educated, but recent job growth in the region has been concentrated in low wage industries. Overall, our region’s standard of living is growing very slowly and we have not made progress in reducing poverty.

**Future Target Setting**

SANDAG is in the process of updating the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS). The updated strategy may result in the refinement of the indicators included in future RCP monitoring reports. In addition, goals developed through the REPS update may serve as future targets for the Economic Prosperity indicators.

**SANDAG Role**

**Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy**

Through the update of the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy, SANDAG will identify the infrastructure investments needed to ensure a rising standard of living for the region’s residents.

Implementing the REPS requires a variety of regional organizations and agencies to coordinate their efforts and to promote the creation of middle and higher income jobs. The REPS also recommends that the region focus on targeted workforce development and training for local residents so that they can attain the jobs created. The prosperity strategy is presented within the three “E”s sustainability framework of Environment, Equity, and Economy. Balancing these areas requires a universal and holistic approach to policy making. Making the REPS an element of the RCP has inextricably linked economic growth, opportunity, and prosperity to quality of life.
PUBLIC FACILITIES
PUBLIC FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION

Our region requires reliable supplies of water and energy, opportunities to reuse and recycle materials, and sufficient disposal options for waste. The region also needs to make more efficient use of its resources. We can do this by locating public facilities where they will most effectively provide access and availability of needed services and protect public health and safety.

To address the importance of public facilities to the San Diego region, this chapter focuses on water supply, energy, and waste management. Key issues include meeting our water demand, energy, and waste management infrastructure needs, and providing public facilities that meet our current and future needs in a timely, efficient, and sustainable manner.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following policy objectives included in the RCP:

WATER SUPPLY
• Ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost-efficient water supply for the San Diego region

ENERGY
• Meet the region’s energy needs in a fiscally and environmentally sound manner

WASTE MANAGEMENT
• Minimize the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities
• Exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above public facilities policy objectives are as follow:

WATER SUPPLY
1. Water Consumption
2. Diversity of Water Supply
3. Recycled Water Use

ENERGY
4. Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand
A goal of the RCP is to ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost efficient water supply for the San Diego region. The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) and local water districts are mandated to supply sufficient water resources to meet the needs of the region. Water Authority demand projections are based on SANDAG population, demographic, housing, and economic forecast numbers. These SANDAG estimates are in turn derived from local land use agencies’ general plans.

With current SANDAG forecasts projecting one million more people in the region by 2030, how the region grows will have a significant impact on future water demand. The types and design of development as well as the locations where development occurs have a direct impact on water consumption and necessary water system infrastructure.

The Water Authority is the wholesale water agency serving 23 retail water agencies in the San Diego region. It is important to note that short-term fluctuation in water demand is primarily due to weather variability. Long-term changes in water demand are typically due to population growth.

Since 1999, total annual water demand within the Water Authority’s service area has fluctuated, as seen in Figure 23. Variations in historic yearly demands are primarily attributable to weather. Changes in annual rainfall and seasonal temperatures can have a significant impact on water use. For example, above normal rainfall in 2005 resulted in a ten percent drop in total water use over the previous year.

As shown in Figure 24, the Water Authority’s long-term regional demand forecast projects a steady increase in total water consumption. These projections are based on normal-year weather conditions. According to the 2005 Water Authority Urban Water Management Plan, total water demand is forecast to increase by over 113,000 acre-feet (1 acre-foot ~ 325,900 gallons) between 2010 and 2030. This increase in consumptive use is driven by projected growth in the region’s population and economy.
Water conservation measures play a substantial role in mitigating water demand increases. On average, from 2000 to 2005, water conservation savings offset over five percent of the region’s total demands, as seen in Figure 25. Local governments can directly affect future water demand by promoting conservation programs within their jurisdictions and implementing water efficiency standards throughout the planning process. Promotion of water saving measures, such as planting native, drought resistant plants and encouraging efficient irrigation through weather-based irrigation controllers can substantially reduce outdoor water use. In addition, implementation of programs such as the ultra-low-flush toilet and high efficiency clothes washer incentives to help reduce water consumption. The 2005 Water Authority Urban Water Management Plan shows about 108,000 acre-feet of conservation savings by 2030, a 62,350 acre-foot increase from 2005 levels.

Figure 23
HISTORIC WATER DEMAND WITHIN WATER AUTHORITY SERVICE AREA (1999-2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports.
Figure 24
REGIONAL HISTORIC AND PROJECTED NORMAL WATER DEMAND (1990-2030)

Forecast includes Camp Pendleton area projected water demands.


Figure 25
REGIONAL WATER CONSERVATION SAVINGS ESTIMATES (1999-2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority.
2. Diversity of Water Supply

Significance

Currently, about 22 percent of the water used within the San Diego County Water Authority service area comes from local sources. Imported water deliveries from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) represent a majority of the region's water supply. MWD secures its imported supply from two main sources, the Colorado River and the State Water Project. The reliability of these two supplies has a direct impact on our region’s water supply availability to meet current needs and future growth.

To lessen demands on a single supply source, the Water Authority has implemented plans and policies to diversify the region's water supply portfolio. Water Authority diversification efforts include: the Water Authority-Imperial Irrigation District water conservation and transfer agreement, acquiring conserved water through the All American and Coachella Canal Lining Projects, and development of local recycling, groundwater, and seawater desalination projects. This diverse supply mix enhances our water supply reliability to meet the needs of the San Diego region.

Findings

As seen in Figures 26 and 27, the Water Authority has made progress toward its diversification strategy. Between 2003 and 2005 the proportional amount of imported water use declined from 85 percent to 79 percent. This reduction is primarily attributed to the Water Authority-Imperial Irrigation District water conservation and transfer agreement, which was finalized through the Colorado River Quantification Settlement Agreement in 2003. By 2021, the transfer will provide 200,000 acre-feet of water or approximately 22 percent of the region’s supply.

Additionally, the Water Authority anticipates development of an in-region seawater desalination facility capable of delivering 50 million gallons of desalinated seawater per day. The seawater desalination facility will help to achieve the target of providing 40 percent of the region’s water through local sources (seawater desalination, conservation, surface water, recycling, and groundwater). Figure 28 shows the diversification goal for the Water Authority for the year 2020.
Figure 26
SAN DIEGO WATER SUPPLY BY SOURCE (2003)

2003

MWD 85%

Groundwater 3%
Local Surface Water 4%
Recycled Water 2%
Conservation 6%

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).

Figure 27
SAN DIEGO WATER SUPPLY BY SOURCE (2005)

2005

MWD 79%

Groundwater 2%
IID Transfer 4%
Local Surface Water 6%
Recycled Water 2%
Conservation 7%

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).
3. **Recycled Water Use**

**Significance**

A fundamental element to developing a diverse supply mix for the region and to using existing water supplies more efficiently is through implementation of water recycling projects. The Water Authority, in conjunction with its member agencies, is promoting recycled water use through funding programs, policies and training.

Several agencies within the San Diego region continue to implement and expand their water recycling projects. Currently, about 13,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water is reused within the Water Authority service area. Nearly 69 percent of the recycled water is used for landscape irrigation and other municipal and industrial uses; the remaining 31 percent is recharged into groundwater basins.
Findings

Over the last several years local recycled water use has exceeded 12,000 acre-feet annually, as seen in Figure 29. The Water Authority will continue to assist local agencies in expanding the use of recycled water through financial assistance programs and policies in support of beneficial reuse. By 2030, Water Authority projections estimate total recycled use at about 47,600 acre-feet. This effort would represent a significant increase in recycled supplies from current levels.

![Figure 29](image_url)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).

4. Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand

Significance

Electricity consumption is the total amount of electricity used in a given day, month, or year, measured in kilowatt-hours (kWh). Peak demand is the highest amount of electricity demand on the electrical system in any given day, measured in kilowatts (kW) or megawatts (MW=1000kW). The highest peak demand is usually during hot summer days in late-August when air-conditioning loads are at their highest.

Population is a key driver for residential consumption, commercial growth, demand for water pumping, and other services. Another key driver of California’s energy demand is personal income. If quality of life factors remain constant, maintaining or reducing the amount of electricity used on a per capita basis is an important indicator to assess how well the region is implementing energy conservation and efficiency measures. To accomplish this, the RCP recommends assessing electricity peak demand (kW) and electricity consumption (kWh) by San Diegans on a per capita basis.
Target

The Regional Energy Strategy 2030 (RES) was approved by SANDAG in 2003. The RES developed policies and provided measurable targets to achieve the region’s sustainable energy vision. The RES called for a reduction in both per capita electricity peak demand and overall per capita electricity consumption back to 1990 levels (5,151 kWh per capita) by 2010.

Findings

Since RES adoption in 2003, per capita electricity consumption has increased an average of two percent per year, and it is approximately 16 percent higher than 1990 levels.

Between 1990 and 2005, per capita electricity consumption has increased by an average of one percent each year, as seen in Figure 30. A significant reduction of seven percent occurred in 2001 during the energy crisis, but consumption regained momentum since. Between 2004 and 2005, per capita consumption increased by 1.3 percent, which was an improvement over a 3.4 percent increase of the year before. If the region is to meet per capita reduction targets, we must do more to implement energy efficiency, conservation, and distributed generation. Technological advancements and behavioral changes also will further this goal. Higher density residential smart growth development also can reduce per capita energy consumption.

Although the region is not on track to meet the significant reductions called for in the RES, San Diego is performing better than national and state averages. California has the lowest per capita electricity consumption of any state and consumes almost 50 percent less electricity per capita than the national average. San Diego’s per capita consumption was 23 percent lower than the state level in 2000 and 15 percent lower in 2003. This is in part due to aggressive statewide energy efficiency and demand reduction goals and due to the milder climate of the San Diego region, as seen in Figure 31.
Figure 30
SAN DIEGO ANNUAL PER CAPITA ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION
(1990-2005)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.

Table 13
ANNUAL PER CAPITA ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION* (kWh) AND DEMAND* (W)
(1990-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego Consumption Use-Per-Capita (kWh)</th>
<th>San Diego Peak Demand Use-Per-Capita (Watts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,581</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,639</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.*Data normalized for weather variations.
5. Share of Energy Produced in the Region vs. Imported

Significance

A recommended action of the RCP is to promote the local production of cost-effective, environmentally sensitive energy to reduce our dependence on imported energy. The proportion of local energy that is supplied from in-region sources directly reflects progress toward this goal. As older, less efficient plants are replaced in the region with more energy-efficient resources, these more environmentally friendly resources are able to operate at higher capacities.

Target

One goal of the Regional Energy Strategy 2030 (RES) is to achieve and maintain the capacity to generate 65 percent of summer peak demand with in-county generation by 2010 and 75 percent by 2020.

Findings

In-region assets currently provide approximately 60 percent of total capacity needs, though their operation is at less than capacity due to the potential environmental impacts and other factors.

The share of energy produced within the region has decreased to roughly 25 percent in 2005. In 1990 and 1995, energy produced in the region remained steady at roughly 34 percent. In 2000, the share peaked at approximately 40 percent as a result of the energy crisis because local large-scale
power plants and smaller generators ran at their maximum capacity. Generally, San Diego’s older in-region resources run at partial capacity for air quality, high fuel cost, and other reasons. Since the crisis subsided, smaller, more distributed generators dependent on natural gas have shut down as fuel prices steeply increased in the 2000s. One measure to increase the share of energy produced in the region would be to replace older, less efficient resources.

6. Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

Significance

The development of renewable energy resources such as wind, solar, and geothermal is specifically encouraged in the RCP and targets have been established in the Regional Energy Strategy and by state law.

Target

The RES, adopted by the SANDAG Board in 2003, includes a goal of increasing the total electricity supply from renewable resources to 15 percent by 2010, 25 percent by 2020, and 40 percent by 2030. Subsequent to the RES, more stringent state law has been adopted requiring 20 percent renewables by 2010. The Governor has also proposed an additional goal of 33 percent by 2020.

In addition to general renewable energy targets, the Regional Energy Strategy 2030 called for an emphasis on in-region renewable installations. For 2010, the RES called for 740 MW of renewables, of which 340 MW (46 percent) are to be in the region. For 2010, the SDG&E 2004 Long Term Resource Plan identified 777 MW of renewables, of which 342 MW (44 percent) are to be in the region.

---

6 Senate Bill 107 was signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger on September 26, 2006. This bill accelerates the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requirement from 2017 to 2010. The RPS is a program that requires investor-owned utilities like SDG&E to, among other things, achieve a 20 percent renewable electricity portfolio by December 31, 2010.
Findings

By 2005, the share of energy produced from renewable resources reached 5.3 percent after ten years at only one percent or less.

Table 16 demonstrates that the share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources increased significantly in recent years. In 2005, SDG&E acquired approximately 5.3 percent of its resource mix from renewable resources. Other investor-owned utilities in the state have achieved higher saturation. In 2006, Pacific Gas & Electric's baseline of renewable power is at 13 percent, while Southern California Edison has 18 percent of eligible renewable power in its portfolio. SDG&E has stated that it will reach the state-required 20 percent RPS in 2010, a target which is five percent higher than the original RES target for that year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 State Target</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 RES Target</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 RES Target</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.

7. Percent of Waste that is Recycled

Significance

The waste management goals of the RCP are to minimize the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities. A second goal is to exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate by the year 2005 and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.

Both goals can be tracked by reviewing the percentage of waste that is diverted from landfills and is instead recycled or put to another use.

---

7 These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules and thus do not include Customer Owned Photovoltaic.
**Target**

Assembly Bill 939 sets forth a target for solid waste diversion. It mandates that 50 percent of solid waste must be diverted from landfills by 2005. As of 2002, the most recent year for which data is available, the region had not yet met the target.

**Findings**

The waste diversion rate has fluctuated since 1995, but the region has not yet reached the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by the State of California, although there has been a slight upward trend over the last ten years, as seen in Figure 32.

![Figure 32](image_url)

**Figure 32**


Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board.

8. **Landfill Space Available**

**Significance**

The waste management goals of the RCP include minimizing the need for additional landfills and providing economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities. The RCP also aims to exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate by the year 2005 and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.
**Findings**

Trend data is currently unavailable; the data source for this indicator, the Countywide Siting Element is completed every five years and only 2002 data are available at this time. The current remaining landfill capacity is represented here in cubic yards. This estimate is based upon existing permitted in-county capacity, excluding the San Onofre and Las Pulgas landfills. This estimate also does not include any landfills planned but not permitted. Therefore, the Gregory Canyon landfill and the expansion of the Sycamore Canyon landfill are not included in the capacity figures.

The estimated number of years of remaining capacity is based on assumptions such as reaching a regionwide diversion rate of 50 percent by 2005, and slight increases in total disposal and exported solid waste. Again, this does not take into account any landfills that are planned but not permitted. The actual year when the county is projected to run out of capacity under this scenario is also listed in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Estimated Years of Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89,044,519</td>
<td>11 (to 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**PUBLIC FACILITIES SUMMARY**

**Conclusions**

Water consumption has remained fairly steady since 2000, but declined slightly between 2004 and 2005. The amount of recycled water used in the region each year has declined. Between 1990 and 2005, electricity consumption per capita has increased by less than 1 percent per year. The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources increased significantly in recent years from 0.5 percent in 1990 to 5.3 percent in 2005; and the share of energy produced within the region generally remains at roughly one-third. The waste diversion rate has fluctuated since 1995, but the region has not yet reached the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by the State of California, although there has been a slight upward trend over the last ten years.

**Future Target Setting**

Three of the eight indicators in this section already have targets. While not impossible, setting targets for indicators such as landfill space will be challenging. The targets will be set by stakeholders and SANDAG staff.
SANDAG Role

Regional Energy Strategy

SANDAG, with other partners, produced the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), which used the technical information of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study to develop a vision for how energy will be produced and consumed in the region. The RES proposes eight goals and the implementation steps necessary to achieve them.

Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy

The Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) was prepared as part of the RCP to provide an investment and financing strategy to help the region meet its combined infrastructure needs. IRIS addresses transportation, water, wastewater, stormwater management, solid waste, energy, education, and parks and open space. The RCP Strategic Initiatives call for further developing guidelines to link annual expenditures of capital improvement programs to the long term goals of facility master plans that incorporate RCP goals.
BORDERS
INTRODUCTION

The San Diego region’s borders have traditionally been thought of as limited to the jurisdictional boundaries of San Diego County. However, over the years, the perceptions of our borders have expanded. San Diego County has increasingly close ties to its neighboring counties and Mexico, which challenge us to think of our region beyond our borders. In addition, San Diego County is home to 17 federally-recognized tribal nations with sovereignty over 18 reservations -- more than any other county in the United States (see Map 5). Our abundant natural resources, as well as our location on the U.S.-Mexico border, make our region an attractive place to live and work. Continued growth here, as well as in the surrounding regions, is evidence of this desirability. The region’s distinct characteristics also present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordination along our interregional and binational borders.

Map 5
THE SAN DIEGO REGION, SOVEREIGN INDIAN NATIONS, AND NEIGHBORING AREAS

Source: SANDAG
An important issue is access to jobs and housing. The growth projected for the San Diego region over the next 30 years is a function of economic expansion and job creation, a continued influx of people moving to the area, and natural population growth within the area. However, home construction in the San Diego region has not kept pace with population growth. Consequently, housing prices have risen, making home ownership difficult for much of the population. As a result, many people who are employed in the region have started moving to neighboring regions, including southwestern Riverside County, Imperial County, and Baja California, in search of homeownership. As people move further away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems, affecting not only the long-distance commuter but also causing congestion for residents in communities along the transportation route.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Provide reliable and efficient transportation systems associated with key trade corridors, interregional commuting corridors, tribal reservations, and ports of entry.

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above borders goal are as follows:

1. Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California
2. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, FAST Program (future indicator)

1. **Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California**

**Significance**

A goal of the RCP relating to interregional and binational commuting is to ensure an efficient flow of people and goods across the international ports of entry and along key trade and interregional commuting corridors. A policy objective towards this goal is to reduce future long-distance interregional and binational commuting. Progress towards this goal can be measured by examining the flow of commuters crossing into the region each day. However, the existing data is limited to the Caltrans Traffic Census, which includes all vehicles, not just commuters. Additional data such as level of service or another measure of congestion would be useful in measuring our progress towards this goal.

The following data examines average weekday traffic volumes at the borders between San Diego and Tijuana, Imperial County, Riverside County, and Orange County, as seen in Figure 33. Total annual passenger vehicle and pedestrian border crossings are examined as well.
Findings

The largest volume of interregional trips takes place between Tijuana, Baja California and the San Diego region, followed by Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County, in that order. Note that these volumes include all vehicles going in both directions, not just commuters. They also include vehicles just passing through the region, for example, those going from Baja to Los Angeles. Between 2000 and 2004, Riverside County became the fastest growing contributor of interregional trips to and from San Diego, with a 37 percent increase in average weekday traffic volumes, as seen in Figure 34. Average weekday traffic volumes to and from San Diego from all neighboring regions grew 15 percent between 2000 and 2004, as seen in Figure 35.

The growth of interregional commuting between Riverside County and San Diego can be attributed to people seeking a lower cost of housing in Riverside County but continuing to work in San Diego. Long-distance commuting, both interregional and from within the region, puts a tremendous strain on our roads, freeways, infrastructure, and personal lives. While some amount of interregional commuting will always occur, providing additional housing capacity in key locations within the more urbanized areas of the region could assist in reducing the projected increases in interregional commuting and provide more housing and transportation choices to our residents. Additionally, another focus needs to be providing jobs in those communities where employees can afford to live.

Between 1997 and 2004, the increase in the number of pedestrian border crossings outpaced the increase in the number of passenger vehicle border crossings; pedestrian border crossings grew 43 percent, while passenger vehicle border crossings grew 38 percent, as seen in Figures 36 and 37. As a result of stricter security screenings since the 9/11 events, there have been longer and more unpredictable waits at the border for vehicle crossings, which may have contributed to a shift from vehicle to pedestrian crossings.

Figure 33
SAN DIEGO REGION AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES TO AND FROM ORANGE, IMPERIAL, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES AND TIJUANA, BAJA CALIFORNIA (2000)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
Figure 34
SAN DIEGO REGION AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES TO AND FROM ORANGE, IMPERIAL, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES AND TIJUANA, BAJA CALIFORNIA (2004)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census

Figure 35
SAN DIEGO REGION AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES TO AND FROM ORANGE COUNTY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, IMPERIAL COUNTY, AND TIJUANA, BAJA CALIFORNIA, (2000-2004)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
Figure 36
NORTHBOUND ANNUAL TOTAL PASSENGER VEHICLE BORDER CROSSINGS (1997-2004)


Figure 37
NORTHBOUND ANNUAL TOTAL PEDESTRIAN BORDER CROSSINGS (1997-2004)

2. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement

Significance

Providing reliable and efficient transportation systems associated with key trade corridors and ports of entry is a goal of the RCP. Wait times at the border provides a way to measure how efficiently people and goods are able to flow across our international ports of entry.

Findings

In 2005, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Web site data, the combined average weekday wait time at the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry (POE) was 34.4 minutes in general passenger vehicle lanes, and 4.4 minutes in SENTRI\(^8\) lanes between 5 a.m. and 9 a.m. However, on a typical weekday, observed waits during the morning peak periods appear to be higher than the delays reported on the CBP Border Wait Times Web page.

For commercial vehicles, CBP reported an average weekday wait time at the Otay Mesa POE of 27.5 minutes in general lanes between noon and 6:00 p.m. However, users report they experience longer waits to cross into the San Diego region. No delay data were available for FAST\(^9\) lanes in 2004 and 2005.

No data on border delays is available prior to 2004. Still, queues at the border have increased and become more unpredictable over time. Border wait times—especially in the northbound direction—are a result of growth in crossborder travel and stricter security screenings coupled with transportation infrastructure constraints.

A recent SANDAG study\(^{10}\) quantified economic opportunities lost because of current and projected traffic congestion and delays at the San Diego-Baja California POEs. In particular, current delays for both personal crossborder trips and freight movement cost the San Diego-Baja California region $4.2 billion in lost output and a loss of more than 35,000 jobs in 2005. If steps are not taken to improve border crossing and transportation infrastructure and management, these losses are projected to more than double in the next ten years.

To provide additional crossborder travel capacity, a new POE has been proposed about two miles east of the existing Otay Mesa crossing. State Route 11, an east-west extension of future State Route 905, would connect the future East Otay Mesa-Otay II POE to a roadway in Tijuana, which would link to the Tijuana-Tecate Toll Road and the Tijuana-Rosarito Corridor.

---

\(^8\) SENTRI is a management process offered by CBP that expedites border crossings for pre-screened participants.

\(^9\) FAST is a commercial process offered by CBP to pre-approved importers, carriers, and registered drivers that results in quicker clearance across the border. FAST is available at the Otay Mesa POE only.

\(^{10}\) SANDAG, Estimating Economic Impacts of Wait Times at the San Diego-Baja California Border, 2006.
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program

Significance and Future Indicator

At least 30,000 commuters pass northward through our border ports of entry on a daily basis\textsuperscript{11}. Projections indicate that cross-border vehicle traffic will more than double between 2000 and 2020. To accommodate the dynamic border transportation system, MOBILITY 2030 includes projects to

\textsuperscript{11} Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times at the San Diego- Baja California Border Region, June 2005
improve access to border crossings, expand freight rail service, coordinate commercial vehicle crossings, and implement programs such as the Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) and Free and Secure Trade (FAST) that expedite border crossings for pre-screened participants. Currently there are approximately 71,000 vehicle SENTRI participants and 5,500 Pedestrian SENTRI participants. In addition, there are 1,588 FAST enrollees.

**BORDERS SUMMARY**

**Conclusions**

Current data suggests that we are not meeting our objective of reducing future long-distance interregional and binational commuting. Interregional and binational trips are increasing and are expected to continue to increase as the population grows. Additional data such as level of service or another measure of congestion would be useful in measuring our progress towards this goal. In addition, periodic surveys of interregional and crossborder travelers would be useful to better estimate the volume or share of commute trips from the overall travel volumes.

**Future Target Setting**

Several work efforts are underway that may begin to establish potential targets for the indicators in this section such as the Otay Mesa-Otay de Mesa Binational Corridor Strategic Plan and the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan. Additionally, indicators measuring cooperation with neighboring jurisdictions, including the region’s Tribal Governments, could be developed as means of measuring inter-regional cooperation.

**SANDAG Role**

I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP)

One of the most active interregional programs at SANDAG is the I-15 IRP. The IRP is a voluntary partnership among elected officials representing communities along Interstate 15. As part of Phase One, SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) worked to address congestion on the I-15 by looking at jobs-housing imbalance. The result was twenty-three short, medium and long term interregional strategies in transportation, economic development and housing. Phase Two involves analyzing the ways in which the Riverside and San Diego economies are connected through a joint employment cluster study. Additionally, several transportation projects are underway including a Caltrans County Line Study to identify transportation issues facing the I-15 corridor and an interregional Bus Rapid Transit bus operation plan. Work is also being done to encourage workforce housing in north San Diego County.

Tribal Liaison Program

It is through the Borders Committee that SANDAG has been pursuing government-to-government relations with tribal governments in the region. In 2002 SANDAG held a regional Tribal Summit as
part of the development of the 2003 RTP. Since that time the agency has incorporated tribal liaison work into its work plan and a “tribal government-to-government” component in its Public Involvement Policy. In 2005, SANDAG built partnerships with two regional intertribal councils – the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA). In that same year, the SCTCA became an advisory member on the SANDAG Borders Committee. SANDAG, together with the RTA and SCTCA, co-hosted the 2006 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit. This second summit was held between elected tribal leaders from the 17 tribes in the San Diego region and the SANDAG Board of Directors which has lead to several follow-up actions to build government-to-government relations including the assembly of an Interagency Tribal Technical Working Group. Additionally, through the Tribal Liaison Program and with assistance from Caltrans, SANDAG will be working with the tribal governments on a Tribal Transit Feasibility Study and the development of a Tribal Transportation Demand Management Plan.

**Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times**

SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans, completed an extensive study to gauge the economic impacts of border wait times on the binational economy. This first set of results, released in June 2005, focused on personal travel. The latest study looked at freight movement. Findings show the effects of border crossing delays on productivity, industry competitiveness, and lost business income at the regional, state, and national level for the United States and Mexico.

Also in partnership with Caltrans, SANDAG has developed an economic model to assess the magnitude of regional economic impacts resulting from delays at the ports of entry. This model will serve as an analysis tool that can be used to understand economic impacts as the volume of travel increases and/or as a result of security screenings.

**Otay Mesa-Mesa De Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan**

The SANDAG Borders Committee and the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) identified the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay binational corridor as an area of opportunity to create an effective binational planning partnership. Transportation, economic development, housing, and environmental conservation are the four key issue areas that were recognized for evaluation as part of the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan. The draft Early Action Plan was released in June 2006. The Final Strategic Plan is anticipated to be completed in early 2007.
## APPENDIX

### RCP INDICATOR DATA STATUS AND TARGET SETTING - 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP SECTION / Indicator</th>
<th>STATUS OF DATA</th>
<th>HOW OFTEN IS THE DATA SOURCE UPDATED?</th>
<th>INDICATOR TARGET SET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Share of New Units Within County Water Authority Boundary</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual Transit Ridership</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commute Mode Shares</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors</td>
<td>Future (1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Every 2 Yrs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Affordability Index</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35% of Income</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category</td>
<td>Partial (2)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vacancy Rates</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Habitat Preserved Within Designated Preserve Areas</td>
<td>Future (4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained</td>
<td>Future (5)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Beach Closure Days</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impaired Water Bodies Based on Federal Clean Water Act Criteria</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Every 2-4 Yrs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beach Widths</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lagoon Health</td>
<td>Future (6)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Air Quality Index</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**

| 1. Labor Force Educational Attainment | Current | Annually | No |
| 2. Balanced Job Growth | Current | Annually | No |
| 3. Employment in High-Wage Clusters | Current | Annually | No |
| 4. Unemployment Rate | Current | Annually | No |
| 5. Real Per Capita Income | Current | Annually | No |
| 6. Regional Poverty Rate | Current | Annually | No |

**PUBLIC FACILITIES**

| 1. Water Consumption | Current | Annually | No |
| 2. Diversity of Water Supply | Current | Annually | No |
| 3. Amount of Recycled Water Used | Current | Annually | No |
| 4. Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand | Current | Annually | No |
| 5. Share of Energy Produced In-County vs. Imported | Current | Annually | Yes |
| 6. Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources | Current | Annually | Yes |
| 7. Percent of Waste That is Recycled | Current | Annually | Yes |
| 8. Landfill Space Available | Current | Every 5 Yrs. | No |

**BORDERS**

| 1. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement | Current | Annually | No |
| 2. Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California | Current | Annually | No |
| 3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, FAST Program | Future (7) | --- | --- |

**Notes:**

A status of “Current” means the indicator reflects the most recent available data.

(1) New data required.
(2) Income category not yet available by local jurisdiction.
(3) Data not available.
(4) Data to become available as plans are completed.
(5) No centralized data currently available, but may be in the future.
(6) Data may be available in 2007.
(7) Data may be available in 2007.
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TRANSNET EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS

File Number 3000800

Introduction

The TransNet Extension includes two significant changes to the transportation sales tax ordinance related to bicycle and pedestrian transportation. First, it includes a provision that requires all new projects or major reconstruction projects funded under the TransNet program to appropriately accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Second, it increases the amount of funding in the competitive grant program for funding bicycle projects from $1 million per year to 2 percent of the revenues per year. At the same time, it expanded the eligible uses for these funds to include pedestrian and neighborhood safety projects. SANDAG staff will be developing guidelines for the competitive grant program over the coming year. This report presents draft guidelines for implementation of this first provision requiring accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians in all TransNet-funded projects.

Recommendation

The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is asked to provide comments and a recommendation to the Transportation Committee on the attached draft policy and guidelines for implementing provisions in the TransNet Extension that require accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic in TransNet-funded projects.

Discussion

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance Extension reads:

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 cost 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.

The 2003 Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030, states that SANDAG will develop guidelines to ensure all regionally funded transportation projects preserve or enhance non-motorized access
(See MOBILITY 2030, Chapter 6, Action Item 31). Section 4(E)(3) was included in the TransNet Ordinance in response to that requirement. Providing better access for pedestrians and bicyclists also is an important implementation item from the 2004 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) because it contributes to providing more transportation choices, which is one of the essential elements of the smart growth development called for in the RCP. Given these policy directions, this provision makes sense because the most cost-effective way to ensure our transportation systems accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic is to provide for them when projects are first constructed or when major reconstruction work is being done.

Implementation of Section 4(E)(3) requires policies and procedures on three main points.

- What constitutes adequate accommodation for pedestrian and bicycle travel?
- When is the cost of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians too expensive for the anticipated use?
- What are the best available standards to which projects must be designed?

In answering these questions, SANDAG’s administrative process should clearly define the roles of the state, local agencies, and SANDAG, including its working groups, policy advisory committees, and the Board. Attachment 1 to this report presents draft policy and procedural guidelines that address these issues. These draft guidelines were first developed in consultation with SANDAG’s Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG), which consists of a staff representative from each of our member agencies plus three persons each representing the interests of bicyclists and pedestrians. Bicycling interests are represented through the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition and pedestrian interests through WalkSanDiego. The guidelines have also been reviewed by the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the version presented in this report reflects the comments of both groups.

**Adequate Accommodation.** What constitutes appropriate facilities for pedestrian and bicycle traffic is largely dependent upon context. What is adequate on a residential street is different from what would work on a major arterial, and what is sufficient in a rural setting is much different from an urban one. Consequently, the attached policy includes a matrix of appropriate facility types for different road types and settings. The bicycle and pedestrian accommodation measures in the matrix were developed largely based on existing best practices within the region, but they also take into consideration exemplary practices from around the country.

In addition to the difference between urban and rural, a distinction can be made between conventional urban and suburban development and the kind of development envisioned in the smart growth areas called for in SANDAG’s RCP. This distinction is important because smart growth areas, more than conventional settings, depend on providing a variety of attractive transportation alternatives. The attached guidelines do not address this distinction, however. This is a topic that will be addressed in the development of smart growth urban design guidelines that SANDAG is about to undertake.

**Reasonable Cost.** The question of reasonable cost is in large part a question of expected demand. Even at very low cost, it probably does not make sense to require a sidewalk along the side of a road if there is no reason to expect pedestrian traffic there. Streets along steep slopes or along freeway rights-of-way are examples where this could apply. On the other hand, the street should
always provide for bicycle and pedestrian traffic if at all possible where there is a demonstrated existing or planned need. In making this determination, the need for access to and from public transit is an important consideration.

Because bicycle traffic is permitted on all roadways except most freeways and because the range of the bicyclist is much greater than a pedestrian, it is not practical to say a section of road would not attract bicycle traffic. Even so, there may be circumstances where providing the recommended facility would be excessively costly or undesirable. Doing so could result in a negative impact on adjacent land uses through loss of property, or it could degrade pedestrian access to name just two examples. In those cases, alternate routes with appropriate accommodation that are in close proximity to the project can provide a reasonable alternative. However, the presence of an acceptable alternative route should not relieve the agency from providing the appropriate bicycle facility when cost and right-of-way are not undue constraints.

The federal guidelines on the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities recommend that these facilities should always be provided unless the cost of doing so exceeds 20 percent of the total project cost. The draft policy and guidelines for the TransNet Ordinance do not propose a cost limit because staff believes there could be circumstances were 20 percent of the project cost would clearly be an excessive amount to spend relative to the need. At the same time, on some smaller projects, 20 percent may not be enough to fund the needed improvements.

The approach taken in the draft policy and guidelines is to put the decision as to when the cost is too high in the hands of the policymakers. The policy and guidelines are based on the assumption that bicyclists and pedestrians will be properly accommodated in nearly all situations and that the conditions under which they would not would, in most cases, be self evident. In those cases where an agency proposes not to provide the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities, the proposed administrative procedures would require the agency to state so explicitly in its public hearing on the projects and to notify SANDAG so that decision could be reviewed by both stakeholders and policymakers. The decision on whether or not the requirements of the Ordinance would be met by the proposed project would be made by the Transportation Committee.

**Design Standards.** An adequate design standard for bicycle facilities is available in Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual (HDM). Since this is a recognized institutional standard for bikeway design, all bikeway improvements constructed under the TransNet program should conform to Chapter 1000 of the HDM.

No similar state guidelines exist for pedestrian facilities; however, the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) publishes the Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, which provides reasonable and widely recognized design standards. SANDAG has published Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, but that document was developed as a reference manual, not as a design standard.

**Next Steps.** Following the review of the draft policy and guidelines by the ITOC, staff will respond to any comments and take any recommendations the ITOC may make to the Transportation Committee. Because there have been substantive changes to the document since it was last seen by the BPWG, staff will provide them with another opportunity for review. In addition, at the last CTAC meeting, they asked that the policy and guidelines be brought back in its final draft form prior to making a recommendation to the Transportation Committee, so they will discuss the matter
again at their March meeting. The Transportation Committee will make a recommendation to the Board of Directors, which has the final responsibility for approving all policies related to the TransNet program. Once the policy and guidelines are approved, they would be used in all future cycles of the TransNet Program of Projects.

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org

- Attachment 1: Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians Under the TransNet Extension Ordinance – Policies and Guidelines
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 a guide to 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 1
Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures*

<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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.</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></td>
<td>• Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context/Facility Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transit Project          | ▪ Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand  
▪ Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).  
▪ Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access. | ▪ Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks.  
▪ Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no less than 0.3 miles between crossings. |
| Major Urban Street       | ▪ Class 2 bike lanes. | ▪ Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.  
▪ ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Collector Street (design speed >35 mph) | ▪ Class 2 bike lanes. | ▪ Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.  
▪ ADA-compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Collector Street (design speed ≤ 35 mph) | ▪ Shared roadway. Where planned average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide. | ▪ Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street.  
▪ ADA-compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Local Street       | ▪ Shared roadway. | ▪ Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street  
▪ ADA-compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Rural Highway            | ▪ Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder. | ▪ ADA-compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |
| Rural Collector Road     | ▪ Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder. | ▪ Not required with no fronting uses  
▪ Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses.  
▪ ADA-compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>▪ Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>▪ Not required with 85th percentile speeds ( \leq 25 \text{ mph} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds ( &gt;25 \text{ mph} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Application of these accommodation measures is subject to sound planning and engineering judgment to ensure the facility is reasonable and appropriate within the land use and transportation context of the overall project.

Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan that was adopted within the last five years and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan as a guide to determining the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum, provide the facilities called for in the plan.

**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 U.S. Department of Transportation’s 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. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy 31 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.
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, such as severe topographic or biological constraints. 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. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of one-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 31) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

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 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 as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee, in approving the TransNet Program of Projects, must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

Effective Implementation

This policy and guidelines will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the policy and guidelines will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.
Introduction

The TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) includes capital improvements on nine major corridor projects including: I-5, I-15, I-805, SR 52, SR 76, the SPRINTER, the Trolley Blue and Orange Lines, and the Mid-Coast transit corridor, along with associated mitigation expenditures through the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). Each year budgets are updated for projects in the TransNet EAP as part of the annual SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program update. Budgets are also updated on a case-by-case basis outside of the annual cycle. This report summarizes key trends affecting the cost of transportation projects, a proposed methodology for escalating TransNet Budgets, budget increases that are proposed at this time, and potential future budget increases that will be addressed on a case-by-case basis at a later date.

Recommendation

The ITOC is asked to review and concur with the proposed methodology for escalating TransNet Budgets and review and concur with the budget increases as defined in this report.

Discussion

Trends

Construction price increases have resulted in increased costs for large capital transportation improvement projects throughout the region. Similar project cost increases are not unique to our region as other parts of the state, nation, and the world are experiencing the same upward trend. Historically, the Caltrans construction index has been used for inflating TransNet project budgets. However, due to the recent rapid escalation of the Caltrans index, this is no longer practical. Oil prices have also experienced rapid escalation. The Caltrans index often mirrors oil price escalation. Chart 1 shows the strong correlation between the price of oil and the Caltrans index with rapid price escalation beginning in 2002.
To put these increases in perspective, Chart 2 shows that during the 1970s, the construction cost index was on pace to double every 5 years, while during the 1980s and 1990s, the index was on pace to double every 20 years. Since 2002 and the development of cost estimates for the TransNet Ordinance, the index has been on pace to double every 4 years. The period of rapid escalation in the 1970s and today can be viewed as adjustment periods. While the price of oil cannot be controlled locally, today’s index adjustment period is compounded by localized labor and material shortages. Building materials like aggregate (rock, gravel, sand) have widespread uses in transportation project construction. The region contains abundant aggregate resources; however, the majority of these sources are in environmentally sensitive areas and/or on military use lands. Currently the region is importing half of the aggregate it consumes. The price of aggregate roughly doubles once it is trucked over 25 miles. Local labor costs have also experienced rapid escalation. The regional cost of living has risen dramatically in recent years. In addition, a construction boom in Western Riverside County had created increased competition for skilled and general labor. Caltrans estimates that labor costs are roughly half of all transportation project construction costs.
Another trend influencing construction cost is the number of contractors bidding on the work. More competition generally means better bid prices. Since 2002, the average number of bidders statewide has dropped from an average of six to a low of three; however, this trend seems to be on the rise. This is most likely due to the recent slow down in housing construction and a gradual workforce shift from the private sector back to the public sector. Chart 3 shows the average number of bidders for Caltrans projects over $5 million and for all Caltrans projects; i.e. projects over and under $5 million.
A labor workforce shift back to the public sector should help to stabilize the cost of transportation projects; however, material prices are expected to continue to escalate at a higher rate than they did in the 1980s and 1990s. A construction boom in China, Eastern Europe, Dubai, and other places in the world is creating a competitive marketplace for a finite supply of resources. Worldwide trends, as well as localized labor and material shortages, have created an adjustment period in the construction index much similar to the adjustment period that occurred in the 1970s during the oil embargo years.

Methodology for Escalating TransNet Budgets

In April 2004, 47 projects were itemized as line items in the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The 47 projects were ratified in November 2004 by County voters with the passage of Prop. A. Two of the line items were for $25 million construction matches, one for the SR 75/SR 282 tunnel construction, and the other for border access improvements. The SR 52 extension project received a line item contribution toward full funding. The line items’ costs in the Ordinance are in 2002 dollars. These line items have become the de facto “TransNet Budgets” for these 47 projects. Detailed analysis was done during the finalization of the TransNet Ordinance. The costs contained in the Ordinance equal the expected revenue available for the life of the TransNet Extension, through 2048.

The TransNet program assumes a 50 percent match from other state and federal sources. Through previous action, the Board has allocated 85 percent of all state and federal sources under its allocation authority toward this match. Passage of Prop.1B last November and SANDAG’s strategy to use future 1B funding for TransNet projects will also help to achieve this 50 percent match. Currently, the state and federal match percentage is less than 50 percent for TransNet Budgets. Future Prop. 1B and other state and federal sources are expected to bring the match amount to the
50 percent level. Chart 4 depicts the current match amounts. This chart is from the TransNet Dashboard used to track and monitor funding plans, schedules, cost estimates, and expenditures against budgets. The TransNet Dashboard is available to the public and can be viewed at www.KeepSanDiegoMoving.com.

**Chart 4**

![Funding Plan for TransNet Early Action Program](image)

As discussed in the previous section, there has been a rapid escalation of the Caltrans construction index. Historically, this index has been used to escalate TransNet Budgets. However, because of the rapid escalation since 2002, this is no longer practical. To the extent that the construction cost estimates escalate at a rate significantly above the rate of growth in the TransNet revenues, the 50 percent TransNet match ratio cannot be maintained, and either a higher ratio of state and federal matching funds will be required to complete the TransNet Expenditure Plan or projects in the Expenditure Plan will need to be deferred.

Because the Caltrans construction index can no longer be used to escalate TransNet Budgets, another index must be found. For the purpose of instilling a culture of budget adherence, achieving a 50 percent state and federal match, and living within our means, it is recommended that TransNet Budgets be escalated at the rate TransNet revenues escalate or at the construction index rate, whichever is less. At a minimum, TransNet Budgets would be escalated at 2 percent each year. Since 2002, TransNet revenue has been escalating at a compounding rate of 6 percent per year. In the Plan of Finance process and for last year’s FY 2007 budget cycle, a rate of 7.25 percent per year was used to escalate the TransNet project budgets. However, as shown Chart 5, 6 percent more closely matches the actual escalation rate. The TransNet revenue escalation rate – or the TransNet Revenue Index – would be closely monitored each year to determine the appropriate budget escalation rate. Once the construction rate adjustment period is over, a switch could be made back to the construction cost index. In the future, if revenue growth exceeds the construction index rate, there may be opportunities to enhance projects in the Expenditure Plan or to consider the addition of new projects. Budgets for previously defined construction matches and contributions are not escalated as these were fixed amounts in the Ordinance.
A rate for escalating budgets to the future year of expenditure must also be determined. During the 1980s and the 1990s, the Caltrans construction index escalated at a steady annual rate of 2.6 percent. For long-term future escalation in the Plan of Finance, SANDAG has been using a rate of 3.6 percent, 1 full percentage point above the historical rate. A rate of 3.6 percent will help to compensate for expected increased labor, right-of-way, and material costs above the escalation rates experienced in the 1980s and 1990s. Each year, the TransNet Budgets (in 2002 dollars) would be escalated to the current year according to the TransNet Revenue Index, or the construction cost index, whichever is less. At a minimum, the TransNet Budgets would be escalated at 2 percent. Then, with a cash flow exercise, the budgets would be escalated at a compounding 3.6 percent to the year of expenditure.

The proposed methodology will require some reworking of the budget each year; however, the methodology will achieve an accurate representation of a budget amount that ties back to the TransNet Ordinance, is based on actual TransNet revenue increases, and forecasts more accurate costs to the year of expenditure. Chart 6 shows how the 3.6 percent escalation rate compares to the historical escalation rate and the adjustment periods.
Proposed Budget Increases

At this time, a budget increase is proposed for the I-15 Middle project. This proposed budget increase is technical in nature. This project is currently under construction and includes the construction of managed lanes between SR 56 and Centre City Parkway. The I-15 Middle project is not an original TransNet project; however, on June 3, 2005, the Board authorized a loan of TransNet funds to the I-15 Middle project, to be paid back with future state and federal funds with interest. The current TransNet Budget listing for I-15 Middle is only for one phase of the larger I-15 Middle project. The phase shown in the TransNet Budget contains the loaned TransNet funds. Currently, the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) contains $427,677,000 for I-15 Middle, the full funding amount. It is recommended that the full cost of I-15 Middle be reflected in the TransNet Budget. This will make the TransNet Budget consistent with the RTIP and allow for a more complete representation of the I-15 Middle project finances in the TransNet Dashboard.

Another proposed budget increase that is technical in nature is to include the TransNet Extension contribution to the SPRINTER project. The SPRINTER project, currently under construction, will provide commuter rail service between Oceanside and Escondido. At the December 15, 2007 Board meeting, the SPRINTER project received a $24,070,000 contribution of TransNet Extension funding to cover potential cost overruns.

Table 1 provides a summary of the proposed budget increases at this time. The new TransNet Budgets total would be $4.09 billion in escalated dollars.
### Table 1
**TransNet Early Action Program- Proposed Budget**
(Thousands $s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Existing Budget (escalated)</th>
<th>Proposed Budget (escalated)</th>
<th>Increase (escalated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1201502</td>
<td>I-15 ML Middle</td>
<td>$79,104</td>
<td>$427,677</td>
<td>$348,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041401</td>
<td>SPRINT Contribution</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$79,104 $451,747 $372,643

Potential Future Budget Increases

All of the TransNet EAP corridor teams are grappling with rapidly inflating labor, right of way, and material costs. Project teams are still in the process of finding solutions and developing options for staying within budget. Future presentations are scheduled for the I-5, I-15, I-805, SR 52, and SR 76 corridors to more clearly define and discuss scope and budget options.

Additional future budget increases will include adding the Blue and Orange Line Trolley Improvements and increased funding levels for the EMP as outlined in the December 15, 2006 Board report on the updated TransNet Plan of Finance for the EAP. The details for these budget items are still being finalized.
SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND
SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT

File Number 1110200

At several meetings last year, the ITOC reviewed the status of the SPRINTER project and the related financial plan for fully funding the project. During those meetings, it was requested that the ITOC and the SANDAG Transportation Committee receive regular updates on the ongoing implementation of the SPRINTER and SANDAG’s independent assessment of the final cost estimates and the schedule for completion of the project. This is the next in that series of status reports.

Attachment for this report:

- Attachment 1 - Transportation Committee report for the February 16, 2007 meeting summarizing the progress on the implementation of the SPRINTER rail project.
San Diego Association of Governments
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
February 16, 2007
AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9

Action Requested: INFORMATION

SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT
File Number 1115200

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
The ITOC previously reviewed and commented on Board Policy No. 31, “TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules” containing a set of TransNet rules which were subsequently adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on November 18, 2005. One of the TransNet rules (No. 17) concerns the required annual TransNet audits of the TransNet recipients (the 18 cities, the County, Caltrans, North County Transit District, and Metropolitan Transit System). Rule 17 (Attachment 1) provides implementing guidelines for these audits. Beginning with the FY 2009 audits, these audits will fall under the purview of the ITOC. Prior to that time, a new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) base must be developed, as prescribed in Section 8 of the Ordinance, which states the following:

**MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT:** It is the intent of the Legislature, as stated in the Act, and the Commission that revenues provided from this measure be used to augment, not supplant, existing local revenues being used for the purposes set forth in Section 4 herein. Each local agency receiving revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) shall annually maintain as a minimum the same level of local discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the last three fiscal years completed prior to the operative date of this Ordinance (Fiscal Years 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03), as was reported in the State Controller’s Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads and as verified by an independent auditor. The maintenance of effort level as determined through this process shall be subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans. Any increase in the maintenance of effort level based on this adjustment shall not exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction’s General Fund revenues over the same time period. The Commission shall not allocate any revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) to any eligible local agency in any fiscal year until that local agency has certified to the Commission that it will include in its budget for that fiscal year, an amount of local discretionary funding for streets and roads purposes at least equal to the minimum maintenance of effort requirement. An annual independent audit shall be conducted to verify that the maintenance of effort requirement for each agency was met. Any local agency which does not meet its maintenance of effort requirement in any given year shall have its funding under Section 4(D)(1) reduced in the following year by the amount by which the agency did not meet its required maintenance of effort level. In the event that special circumstances prevent a local agency from meeting its maintenance of effort requirement, the local agency may request up to three additional fiscal years to fulfill
its requirement. Such a request must be approved by the Commission. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall also review such requests and make recommendations to the Commission. Any local street and road revenues not allocated pursuant to the maintenance of effort requirement shall be redistributed to the remaining eligible agencies according to the formula described in Section 4(D)(1). The maintenance of effort requirement also shall apply to any local agency discretionary funds being used for the other purposes specified under Section 4. In addition, revenues provided from this Ordinance shall not be used to replace other private developer funding that has been or will be committed for any project.

The current TransNet Ordinance contains similar maintenance of effort requirements. SANDAG’s auditors, Caporicci and Larson (C&L), are in the process of finalizing the FY 2006 TransNet audits (a total of 22), all of which are substantially complete.

Staff has been working with C&L to develop a set of procedures (Attachment 2) for the auditors to use to establish the new MOE base, as required under Section 8 of the Ordinance (above). The result of these procedures will be a new MOE base to be applied in fiscal year 2009, which is the first year the requirements under the new TransNet Ordinance will apply. We selected three cities to review the proposed set of procedures with the purpose of obtaining their input. Comments and feedback received from the City of Escondido and the City of Chula Vista have been incorporated into the attached procedures. Staff has a meeting scheduled on February 15 with the City of San Diego and will verbally update the ITOC at the meeting regarding any additional comments received from the City of San Diego.

C&L is prepared to begin the process of establishing the new MOE base immediately. The work should be completed by June 2007, at which time they will report the results to the ITOC. The first year that the new MOE base will be used is not until FY 2009, however for the recipient’s budget planning purposes, it is important for them to have this information by the fall of this year (which is when they will begin their FY 2009 budget process). Attachment 3 contains a table that shows when the MOE base will be reindexed (required every three years) and for which fiscal year audits each index will be applicable.

Attachments: 1. Rule No. 17, SANDAG Board Policy No. 31
   2. Proposed Maintenance of Effort Procedures
   3. Schedule of Maintenance of Effort Index Dates and Corresponding Audit Periods
EXCERPT FROM BOARD POLICY NO. 31
(12/15/06 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING)

TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES

The following rules have been adopted and amended by the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of these rules is to implement the provisions of the original TransNet Ordinance (87-1) and the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01).

Rule #17: Fiscal and Compliance Audits

Adoption Date: November 18, 2005

Text: I. Fiscal and Compliance Audit Procedures

The fiscal and compliance audit is an essential tool to determine that TransNet funds are being used for the intended purposes. The Commission has the fiduciary responsibility to ensure that the public funds are used in accordance with the TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. In order to complete the audits in a timely manner, SANDAG proposes the following:

A. July/August: SANDAG meets with the auditors to review the audits required for the year and provide all necessary documentation/information for the auditors to begin work.

B. September to November: Auditors schedule site visits. Recipient agencies must be ready and available to meet with the auditors and provide requested financial schedules and other information necessary for the completion of the audit.

C. November/December: Auditors issue draft reports to both SANDAG and the agencies. The agencies must be available to review and comment on the draft report in a timely manner. All outstanding issues should be resolved within four weeks.

D. December/January: Auditors issue the final reports. If there are outstanding issues, those should be resolved so that the audit is completed no later than March.

SANDAG Responsibility: SANDAG will provide all information necessary to complete the audit.

Agency Responsibility: All agencies must be ready for the site visit, provide requested information, and review and comment on the draft reports in a timely manner.

If the auditor is unable to complete the audit because an agency was not ready or did not provide the required information or reviews in a timely manner, then the agency will be deemed in noncompliance of the Ordinance.
SANDAG will withhold future TransNet payments (except for required debt service payments) until the audit is completed.

The Ordinance states that the Commission:

[S]hall not allocate any revenues...to any eligible local agency in any fiscal year until that local agency has certified to the Commission that it will include in its budget for that fiscal year an amount of local discretionary funding for street and roads purposes at least equal to the minimum maintenance of effort requirement. An annual independent audit shall be conducted to verify that the Maintenance of Effort requirements were met. Any local agency which does not meet its Maintenance of Effort requirement in any given year shall have its funding reduced in the following year by the amount by which the agency did not meet its required Maintenance of Effort level. Any local street and road revenues not allocated pursuant to the Maintenance of Effort requirement shall be redistributed to the remaining eligible agencies according to the formula described in [the Ordinance].

Although there are no specific MOE requirements for the highway, transit, or other discretionary programs, the verification of fund usage is essential. Therefore, the withholding of TransNet fund payments applies to all agencies that do not have a completed audit.

II. Exceptions

SANDAG acknowledges the existence of unforeseen circumstances which may prevent an audit from completion. Should situations warrant an extension, the agencies must submit a request for an extension to be considered by the SANDAG Transportation Committee, including an explanation of the situation and specific timelines for completion of the audit.

III. Audit Adjustments

Specific Project Funding/Discretionary Programs

This section applies to funding allocated for the specified projects under the Highway and Transit Programs under Ordinance 87-1, including funding allocated for bicycle facility improvements. Under the TransNet Extension (Ordinance 04-01), this section applies to the Major Corridor funding - Section 4(A) and (B) and the four discretionary programs: (1) Transit Senior program - Section 4(C)(2); (2) Local Environmental Mitigation program - Section 4(D)(2); (3) Local Smart Growth Incentive program - Section 4(D)(3); and (4) Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Program - Section 2(E).

After the projects are completed and there are funds remaining, the agency is required to return the money to the program. After the fiscal audit determines that the project has been completed, SANDAG will transmit a letter to the agency to return the funds to SANDAG. The agency must remit the balance within 60 days of the letter. Should an agency fail to respond in a timely
manner, all future TransNet payments (including funds from the other programs) to that agency will be suspended until the funds are returned.

Local Street and Road Formula Program (Section 4(C) of Ordinance 87-1 and Section 4(D)(1) of Ordinance 04-01) and Transit Funding (Section 4(B) of Ordinance 87-1 and Sections 4(C)(1), 4(C)(3), and 4(C)(4) of Ordinance 04-01).

The audit identifies the status of each project funded with TransNet funds – i.e., completed projects, projects that have negative balances, inactive projects, and ongoing projects. The agencies are responsible to work with the auditors to make proper adjustments as follows:

Completed projects: once a project is identified as completed and there are TransNet funds remaining with that project, the agency is required to transfer the balance to another TransNet-eligible project (any project included in the approved Program of Projects). The audit should make note to which project the funds will be transferred. Completed projects should no longer show in the following year’s audit.

Projects with negative balances: an ongoing project or a completed project may have expended all the TransNet funds but the agency decided to augment with other funds. In this case, the project should show zero balance for the amount of TransNet expended rather than showing a negative balance. If the project is completed, then it should no longer show in the following year’s audit. If the project is ongoing and the agency intends to backfill the project with the following year’s TransNet funds, then it should be noted in the audit. However, this practice is discouraged as it will throw off the MOE calculation.

Inactive projects: if a project has had no activity over a period of two audits, the agency must either close out the project or note when the project will be completed. These projects should no longer show in the following year’s audit. Any remaining TransNet funds must be transferred to another TransNet-eligible project.

IV. Local Agency Balance Limitations

Based on the audit, an agency that maintains a balance of more than 30 percent of its annual apportionment (after debt service payments) must use the remaining balance to fund projects. SANDAG will defer payment until the unused balances fall below the 30 percent threshold.
PROPOSED MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT PROCEDURES

1) Obtain from SANDAG a copy of the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (the “Ordinance) and review.


   a) identify the reported amount of local discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes for the 3 fiscal years ending June 30, 2001, 2002 and 2003.

   b) inquire as to whether there were any adjustments to the amounts identified in (a) above subsequent to the submission to the State Controller.

   c) inquire as to the Local Agency’s process for determining the classification of local discretionary funds versus non-discretionary funds.

   d) inquire as to the amount of local discretionary funds used for other purposes specified in Section 4 of the Ordinance during the three year period. These purposes include the major highway and transit projects specified in the Expenditure Plan, transit operating and capital purposes, specialized transportation services for seniors and disabled persons, transit pass subsidies, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, infrastructure improvements in support of smart growth development, and habitat-related environmental mitigation activities (including management and monitoring, land acquisition, and habitat restoration work). This amount would be included in the MOE base.

   e) For each of the 3 years, obtain a list of individual revenues supporting the amount recorded in the State Controller’s Annual Report as discretionary local funds and perform the following:

      i) Select individual items totaling to 25% of the total dollar amount reported as discretionary local funds and review supporting documentation for each item selected to determine if the revenues were properly classified as discretionary local funds.

   f) For each of the 3 years, obtain a list of individual revenues supporting the amount recorded in the State Controller’s Annual Report as nondiscretionary local funds and perform the following:

      i) Select individual items totaling to 25% of the total dollar amount reported as nondiscretionary local funds and review supporting documentation for each item selected to determine if the revenues were properly classified as nondiscretionary local funds.

   g) Prepare a conclusion, based on the work performed, on the reasonableness of the classification of revenues reported in the State Controller’s Annual Report as local discretionary revenue used to fund street and road expenditures.

      i) If a negative conclusion is reached, cease further efforts and contact SANDAG for guidance.
3) Obtain a representation letter from the Local Agency representing that the revenues are classified correctly between discretionary and nondiscretionary sources and that they have provided us with any local discretionary sources spent on expenditures that fall in the other qualifying categories as referenced in 2c above.


6) In accordance with the Ordinance, perform the following for each identified Local Agency:

   a) Calculate the average local discretionary expenditures on streets and roads (as reported in the State Controller's Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads (Annual Street Report)) and for other purposes as specified in Section 4 (as represented by the Local Agency) for the 3 fiscal years ending June 30, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

      i) The calculation of the average local discretionary expenditures would involve summing the three years of expenditures and dividing by 3.

   b) Calculate the growth rate in the Construction Cost Index for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2006 over the Construction Cost Index as of June 30, 2003.

      i) The calculation of the growth rate of the Construction Cost Index would involve determining the percentage change of the Index by taking the Index as of June 30, 2006 and dividing it by the Index at June 30, 2003.

   c) Calculate the growth rate in the Local Agency's General Fund revenues for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2006 over the amount of General Fund revenues as of June 30, 2003.

      i) The calculation of the growth rate would involve determining the percentage change of the General Fund revenues by taking total General Fund revenues, as reported in the Local Agency's annual financial report as of June 30, 2006 and dividing it by total General Fund revenues as reported in the Local Agency's annual financial report as of June 30, 2003.

   d) Compare the growth rate in the Construction Cost Index as calculated in 6(b) above with the growth rate in General Fund revenues calculated in 6(c) above and select the lowest rate.

   e) Apply the growth rate selected in 6(d) above to the MOE base developed in 6(a) above and determine the adjusted MOE base as of June 30, 2006.

7) Prepare a report for each Local Agency noting the results of the procedures performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOE Re-Indexed</th>
<th>Used for Fiscal Year Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP): AMENDMENT NO. 3

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Approved by the SANDAG Board on August 4, 2006, the 2006 RTIP is a $6 billion program of projects funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources from FY 2007 to FY 2011. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a joint letter approving the 2006 RTIP. Although SANDAG processes amendments on a quarterly basis, this off-cycle amendment is specifically for transit projects.

Amendment No. 3 contains revisions to transit projects implemented by the North County Transit District (NCTD), the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and SANDAG. Each year, both transit agencies, in coordination with SANDAG, develop the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which identifies capital projects to be implemented in the next year. CIP projects are funded with federal, state, TransNet, and other local funds and are subject to approval by the SANDAG Board. The CIP serves as the basis to update the projects in the RTIP, which is required for the NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG to submit grant applications to the FTA.

At its meeting on March 16, 2007, the Transportation Committee is scheduled to recommend the approval of the CIP and Amendment No. 3 to the 2006 RTIP to the Board of Directors at its March 23, 2007 meeting.

Role of the ITOC

Based on the provisions of the TransNet Extension Ordinance, the ITOC is responsible for reviewing projects proposed for funding with TransNet funds and providing comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and to the Board of Directors for consideration when actions are taken on the RTIP. The text of Ordinance Paragraph #8 relating to the ITOC’s role in the RTIP process is provided below:

8. “Review and comment on the programming of TransNet revenues in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). This provides an opportunity for the ITOC to raise concerns regarding the eligibility of projects proposed for funding before any expenditures are made. In addition to a general eligibility review, this effort should focus on
significant cost increases and/or scope changes on the major corridor projects identified in the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.”

Discussion

The CIP and projects in Amendment 3 include transit capital, planning, and operating projects. For purposes of this discussion with the ITOC, only the projects funded through the TransNet Extension program are included in this report. The TransNet Ordinance established a program to provide funding to the transit operators for operations and capital improvements. Table 1 includes two projects for operations (NCTD34 and MTS23A) and the remaining for ongoing miscellaneous capital projects. In response to the discussion at the last ITOC meeting, Table 2 provides a summary of the expenditures for these projects as compared to the available revenues under the TransNet transit formula funds. The table shows that both agencies have sufficient revenues to implement the programmed projects.

In addition to these operating and miscellaneous capital projects, the SPRINTER project (NCTD16, page 4) is included in this amendment. At the December 2006 meeting, the Board of Directors approved the programming of $24 million in TransNet-Major Corridors (MC) funding to complete the project. This amendment reflects that Board action and is consistent with the financial plan for the project reviewed and supported by the ITOC. Note that the SPRINTER project is not included as part of the summary on Table 2. Revenues in Table 2 represent the transit formula funding for operations and miscellaneous capital projects, while major capital projects such as the SPRINTER and the other Early Action Program projects are funded through the Major Corridor program of the TransNet Extension.

In accordance with federal regulations, the draft list of projects was distributed for 30-day public review and comment on January 30, 2007. Any significant comments received from the public, as well as from the ITOC, will be incorporated into the final document.

- Attachment 1 – Table 1: 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Amendment No. 3 – TransNet-Funded Projects
- Attachment 2 – Table 2: TransNet Extension Transit Program
### Table 1
2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 3 - TransNet Funded Projects
San Diego Region (in $000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>MPO ID: NCT003</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>RTIP #: 06-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: ADA Paratransit Services</td>
<td>Exempt Category: Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: Operating cost associated with providing ADA/Paratransit services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE REASON: Reduce funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$5,450</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$710</td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$5,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$12,069</td>
<td>$4,471</td>
<td>$1,779</td>
<td>$1,851</td>
<td>$1,903</td>
<td>$2,005</td>
<td>$12,069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - ADA</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td></td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (S&amp;D)</td>
<td>$1,111</td>
<td>$609</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,723</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,819</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,018</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,320</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$6,510</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$6,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$12,045</td>
<td>$4,471</td>
<td>$1,779</td>
<td>$1,879</td>
<td>$1,911</td>
<td>$2,005</td>
<td>$12,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - ADA</td>
<td>$683</td>
<td></td>
<td>$331</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (S&amp;D)</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$609</td>
<td>$244</td>
<td>$257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,348</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,742</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,957</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,348</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
### Amendment No. 3 - TransNet Funded Projects
#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**North County Transit District**

**MIPO ID:** NCTD18  
**Capacity Status:** CI  
**RTIP #:** 06-03

**TITLE:** Oceanside-Escondido Rail Project  
**DESCRIPTION:** From Oceanside Transit Center to Escondido - design & construct 22 mile light rail (Sprinter) including 15 stations and maintenance facility  
**CHANGE REASON:** Increase funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td>$151,416</td>
<td>$684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td>$2,097</td>
<td>$142,073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$9,093</td>
<td>$3,743</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds AC</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td>$(12,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 108</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td>$17,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$55,515</td>
<td>$5,515</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-GF RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td>$24,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$110,312</td>
<td>$82,168</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td>$13,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$460,268</td>
<td>$346,503</td>
<td>$100,419</td>
<td>$13,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,530</td>
<td>$47,133</td>
<td>$401,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>$152,100</td>
<td>$151,416</td>
<td>$684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td>$3,392</td>
<td>$140,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 108</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-GF RIP State Cash</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$98,963</td>
<td>$78,011</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$365,624</td>
<td>$343,988</td>
<td>$11,184</td>
<td>$10,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,530</td>
<td>$48,884</td>
<td>$305,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
## Amendment No. 3 - TransNet Funded Projects
### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**North County Transit District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: NCTD18B</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>RTIP #: 06-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE:</strong> Oceanside to Escondido Rail Operations</td>
<td><strong>Exempt Category:</strong> Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong> Start-up operating cost for the Sprinter; debt service payments on $34 million COP's after construction is completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGE REASON:</strong> Reduce funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$11,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$13,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$3,109</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,555</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$777</td>
<td></td>
<td>$777</td>
<td></td>
<td>$777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,886</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,777</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$11,555</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$13,555</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOPO ID:** NCTD18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$8,593</td>
<td>$1,781</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>$1,936</td>
<td>$1,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>$2,675</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$2,256</td>
<td>$1,756</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,841</strong></td>
<td>$4,456</td>
<td>$3,675</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
<td>$2,420</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$15,841</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$3,491</td>
<td>$1,781</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>$7,071</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>$2,096</td>
<td>$2,096</td>
<td>$2,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$478</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$2,006</td>
<td>$1,756</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,958</strong></td>
<td>$4,456</td>
<td>$2,641</td>
<td>$2,620</td>
<td>$2,620</td>
<td>$2,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,958</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
#### Amendment No. 3 - TransNet Funded Projects
#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**North County Transit District**

**MPO ID:** NCTD34  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**RTIP #:** 06-03  
**TITLE:** Expanded Transit Service  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance  
**DESCRIPTION:** Operating support for existing fixed route and rail transit service  
**CHANGE REASON:** Add new funding source, increase funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5317 - NF</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,089</td>
<td>$11,826</td>
<td>$13,883</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$22,499</td>
<td>$12,573</td>
<td>$4,830</td>
<td>$5,096</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$59,385</td>
<td>$12,573</td>
<td>$4,886</td>
<td>$11,089</td>
<td>$11,826</td>
<td>$13,883</td>
<td>$59,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$22,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,927</td>
<td>$11,714</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$22,499</td>
<td>$12,573</td>
<td>$4,830</td>
<td>$5,096</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$45,141</td>
<td>$12,573</td>
<td>$4,830</td>
<td>$10,927</td>
<td>$11,714</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
### Amendment No. 3 - TransNet Funded Projects
#### San Diego Region (in $000s)

**San Diego Metropolitan Transit System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: MTS23A</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>RTIP #: 06-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: TransNet Expanded Service Subsidy</td>
<td>Exempt Category: Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: Operating support for existing service</td>
<td>CHANGE REASON: Reduce funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$77,497</td>
<td>$24,911</td>
<td>$25,823</td>
<td>$26,763</td>
<td>$77,497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$36,121</td>
<td>$16,735</td>
<td>$19,386</td>
<td>$36,121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,823</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,763</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113,618</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - TSI</td>
<td>$98,462</td>
<td>$30,729</td>
<td>$32,712</td>
<td>$35,021</td>
<td>$98,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit</td>
<td>$38,136</td>
<td>$16,735</td>
<td>$21,401</td>
<td>$38,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136,598</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,401</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,712</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136,598</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Advanced Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>BIA</td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Corridors and Borders Infrastructure Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under TEA-21 (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 115</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under FY 2004 Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMO-Sec 117/STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program under FHWA Administrative Program (congressionally directed appropriations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBRR</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation under TEA-21 (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESR2S</td>
<td>Hazard Elimination System/Safet Routes to School (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Demonstration Program under SAFETEA-LU (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRC</td>
<td>Innovative Bridge Research &amp; Construction (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPD</td>
<td>National Corridor Planning &amp; Development (Federal - part of CBI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH</td>
<td>Public Lands Highway (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Account (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP AC</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program federal share (for Caltrans use only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP State Cash</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program cash match (for Caltrans use only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-IIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Interregional Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP-RIIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program - Regional Improvement Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Community &amp; System Preservation (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act-Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities (State)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancement Activities Program (Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-H</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Highway (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-78</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - SR 78 (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RTIP
### Fund Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Major Corridors (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-REMP</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Regional Environmental Mitigation (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-TSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit System Improvements (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local System Improvements (Local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (NS)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary - New Starts Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization (Rail Mod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5310</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5316 (JARC)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Jobs Access Reverse Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5317 (NF)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration New Freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**TransNet Extension Transit Program (Amendment No 3 to the 2006 RTIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North County Transit District</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD03  ADA Paratransit Services</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD16B  Oceanside to Escondido Rail Operations</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD18  Rail - ROW Improvements</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD34  Expanded Transit Service</td>
<td>$11,089</td>
<td>$11,826</td>
<td>$13,883</td>
<td>$36,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TransNet Programmed</td>
<td>$12,974</td>
<td>$13,731</td>
<td>$13,883</td>
<td>$40,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS23A  TransNet Expanded Service Subsidy</td>
<td>$24,911</td>
<td>$25,823</td>
<td>$26,763</td>
<td>$77,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TransNet Programmed</td>
<td>$26,008</td>
<td>$27,845</td>
<td>$29,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Revenues Available</td>
<td>$26,008</td>
<td>$27,845</td>
<td>$29,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Programmed in Amendment No. 3</td>
<td>($24,911)</td>
<td>($25,823)</td>
<td>($26,763)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Remaining</td>
<td>$1,097</td>
<td>$2,022</td>
<td>$3,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the last meeting, ITOC members received an update on the implementation status of the various programs authorized by the passage of Proposition 1B in November 2006. Because these funding programs offer the potential of providing a significant amount of state matching funds for the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP), ITOC members expressed an interest in receiving periodic updates on the status of the Proposition 1B programs.

Last month, the ITOC reviewed the list of candidate projects that the SANDAG Board approved in December 2006 for submittal under the competitive Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program. The projects being submitted are all consistent with the TransNet EAP. The ITOC will be provided with updated information on the status of those applications, which are currently under review by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

The focus of this month’s update will be on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation program. A copy of the staff draft proposal regarding the STIP Augmentation program, scheduled to be discussed at the February 16, 2007 Transportation Committee, is attached. In addition, the ITOC will be provided with any new information available regarding the new State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) or any of the other new programs authorized by Proposition 1B.

Attachments for this report include:

- Attachment 1 - Transportation Committee report for the February 16, 2007 meeting summarizing the staff draft proposal for the new STIP Augmentation program
Action Requested: INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION

2006 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AUGMENTATION  File Number 1109100

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). 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Target (through FY 2010-2011)</th>
<th>Public Transportation Account Target (through FY 2010-2011)</th>
<th>Potential Advanced Funds (from FY 2011-2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$85,079,000</td>
<td>$35,002,000</td>
<td>$43,654,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>$122.185</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>$98.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransNet EAP Transit Project Options:</strong></td>
<td>$16.990</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>$0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2006 STIP Augmentation: 15 percent for non-TransNet EAP (approximately $24.6 million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-TransNet EAP Project Options</th>
<th>Amount</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.
Submittal Status

Not included in SANDAG staff recommendation for programming due to lack of a completed PSR. Once the PSR is completed, the project may be re-submitted for STIP funds as part of the 2008 STIP funding cycle.

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 SPRINT 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.
Submittal Status

Staff recommends that this project be programmed due to the ability to complete this project in FY 2008, the relatively low cost and high impact on capacity for the Coaster service.

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.