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## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**Friday, April 27, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF MARCH 23, 2007, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

| +3.     | ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES | APPROVE |

This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on March 23, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on April 6, the Executive Committee on April 13, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on April 20, 2007.

### CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 5)

| +4.     | CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (Shelby Tucker) | APPROVE |

At its April 6, 2007, meeting, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the California Coastal Commission in substantially the same form as attached to the report. The MOA would establish a process for the administration of the newly established Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund.

| +5.     | REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (Renée Wasmund) | INFORMATION |

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director during February 2007.
CHAIR’S REPORTS (6 through 7)

6. RECOGNITION OF REAR ADMIRAL (SELECT) MICHAEL GIORGIONE INFORMATION

7. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG INFORMATION

Board members will provide brief reports on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

REPORTS (8 through 13)

+8. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT REVENUE CONSTRAINED AND REASONABLY EXPECTED REVENUE SCENARIOS* (San Diego Councilmember Jim Madaffer, Transportation Committee Chair; Mike Hix) ACCEPT

Staff will present the revised Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). These scenarios will be included in the Draft 2007 RTP scheduled to be released in June 2007. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept the scenarios for use in the development of the Draft 2007 RTP.

+9. OVERVIEW OF URBAN PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT AND BUS PROGRAM PROPOSALS ((San Diego Councilmember Jim Madaffer, Transportation Committee Chair; Samuel Johnson) APPROVE

Staff will provide information on the U.S. Department of Transportation Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA) solicitation, including the timeline for grant submittals and available funding programs. Staff will present concepts for consideration and inclusion in the proposed SANDAG UPA submittal for the San Diego region. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG submittal of proposals for the UPA and other supporting grant opportunities.

+10. FY 2007 BUDGET AMENDMENT: GOODS MOVEMENT POLICY MANAGER (Bob Leiter) APPROVE

The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the proposed amendment to the FY 2007 Budget to change the classification of a Senior Transportation Planner position (Class No. 22) to Goods Movement Policy Manager (Class No. 30), and to authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the San Diego Unified Port District in substantially the same form as attached to the report. Partial funding for the position would be provided by the Port District.
INTERSTATE 15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP: PHASE II FINAL DRAFT REPORT (Imperial Beach Councilmember Patricia McCoy, Borders Committee Chair; Jane Clough-Riquelme)

The Borders Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the Final Report for Phase II of the Interstate 15 Interregional Partnership (IRP). The report summarizes the results of transportation, economic development, and housing strategies pursued during Phase II, including the two-county employment cluster study and the Caltrans cooperative county line transportation study.

FY 2007 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: REGIONAL ENERGY PLANNING PROGRAM (Susan Freedman)

The Board of Directors is asked to amend the FY 2007 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept $450,000 in funding from the California Energy Commission (CEC) to assist in implementing the Regional Energy Planning Program. The Board of Directors also is asked to authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements with the CEC consistent with the descriptions in the report.

STATE ROUTE 52 CORRIDOR UPDATE (San Diego Councilmember Jim Madaffer, Transportation Committee Chair; Joel Haven, Caltrans)

The Caltrans Corridor Director will provide an update on the status of the State Route (SR) 52 Corridor, including operational improvement projects, the SR 52 Freeway Extension to SR 67, and the SR 52 Managed Lanes project. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve funding Option A, which will allow for the completion of SR 52 Freeway Extension project (a Tier 1 TransNet project) and the completion of the environmental phase of the SR 52 Managed Lanes project. Regional funding priorities will be reestablished in the update to the Regional Transportation Plan that is currently underway.

CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9 SUBDIVISION (b): ANTICIPATED LITIGATION – ONE POTENTIAL CASE (John Kirk)

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board of Directors Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 11, 2007, at 10 a.m. The next Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, May 25, 2007, at 9 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego Regional Transportation Commission item
Chair Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:08 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Bud Lewis (Carlsbad) and a second by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the minutes from the February 23, 2007, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, solicited donations for the 2007 Multiple Sclerosis Walk for Water Walkers, on Friday, April 20, at the Mission Beach Plunge. He thanked Board members for their past support. He said that we need more low-floor trolleys and hoped that monies have been set aside for this purpose. He thought the increasing cost of gasoline would encourage consumers to use buses and the Trolley more frequently for some trips.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, said that the role of the internal audit function should be independent and professional in order to give honest and unbiased expressions of what is happening in the agency. It also is important that these independent audit reports be readily available to the public.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, announced that next week Caltrans will be finishing the construction on the Interstates 5/805 interchange. He mentioned that last week Caltrans went before the California Coastal Commission and received its approval for a coastal permit for the Interstate 5 (I-5)/Lomas Santa Fe interchange project.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (Coronado) announced that Communications Director Garry Bonelli has been selected for Admiral in the US Navy.

Chair Sessom announced that on February 22, 2007, RideLink, the SANDAG transportation demand management program (TDM), was recognized by the San Diego Regional Energy Office with a “SANDEE” award. This award is given to those projects that achieved significant energy savings in San Diego County. RideLink was recognized for its work assisting commuters looking for alternatives to driving alone. Our TDM program supports more than 550 vanpools that save 544,052 gallons of fuel each month. In addition, the vanpools carry 4,760 passengers, resulting in a reduction of more than 8,500 vehicle trips every day. SANDAG and the RideLink staff should be applauded for their efforts.
Chair Sessom recognized the attendance of Board members Commissioner Mike Bixler, from the San Diego Unified Port District, and Supervisor Victor Carrillo, from the County of Imperial.

3. ACTIONS FOR POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

This item summarizes the actions taken by the Transportation Committee on March 2, the Executive Committee on March 9, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on March 16.

Action: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the SANDAG Board approved Agenda Item No. 3, Actions from Policy Advisory Committees. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 7)

4. AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2007 PROGRAM BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM: STATE, REGIONAL, AND FEDERAL ENTERPRISE RETRIEVAL SYSTEM PROJECT (APPROVE)

The State, Regional, and Federal Enterprise Retrieval System (SRFERS) is a grant-funded project with the primary objective of enhancing positive identification through the exchange of booking and driver’s license photos between states. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has just awarded the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) new grant funding for Phase II of the project. At its March 16, 2007, meeting, the Public Safety Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2007 Program Budget and Overall Work Program to accept an additional $999,760 in federal funding for the SRFERS project.

Escondido Councilmember Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]), noted a discrepancy on page 4 of the report; the amounts are off by $1.

5. FY 2008 TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (APPROVE)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have developed their Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) for FY 2008, which form the basis for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307; Urbanized Area formula fund grant; the Section 5309, Rail Modernization formula fund grant; and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendment for transit CIP projects. The Transportation Committee recommends that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve: (1) the FY 2008 Transit CIP for the San Diego region including the transfer of funds from MTS to SANDAG for planning studies; (2) the submittal of FTA Sections 5307 and 5309 applications for the San Diego region; and (3) Resolution No. 2007-19, adopting Amendment No. 3 to the 2006 RTIP.

Mayor Lewis noted that this report indicates that the capital projects to install additional parking at the COASTER stations would not be implemented for several years. He said that
Carlsbad has two COASTER stations, and parking is overflowing to adjacent areas. People parking in Carlsbad commercial areas will be heavily ticketed. He asked that funds be made available to increase the parking supply at the existing stations.

6. FISCAL YEAR 2006 AUDITED COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Bylaws, the Recommendations to Management and the FY 2006 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, including the independent auditor’s financial and compliance opinions, are presented for informational purposes. When complete, copies of the final report will be distributed to each member agency.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) asked about the action item on No. 6. Chair Sessom replied that the Board is receiving the report but not approving it.

7. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director during January 2007.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mickey Cafagna (Poway) and a second by First Vice Chair Pfeiler, the SANDAG Board voted to approve Consent Item Nos. 4 through 7, including Resolution No. 2007-19. Yes – 19. No – 0. Abstain – 0. Absent – None.

CHAIR’S REPORTS (8 through 9)

8. BIKE TO WORK DAY 2007 (APPROVE)

Chair Sessom said that the SANDAG Board is being asked to approve a resolution in support of Bike to Work Day, which is Friday, May 18. Bike to Work Day raises awareness of commuting alternatives, which in turn, helps reduce growing traffic congestion. Biking is only one of the many transportation choices available to commuters. She urged member agencies to approve similar proclamations. She asked Caltrans to post a notice of this event on the changeable message signs around the region. She further suggested that the City and County of San Diego and other public service cable networks post the information on this event on their community television outlets.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Patricia McCoy (Imperial Beach) and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the SANDAG Board approved Resolution No. 2007-21 proclaiming Friday, May 18, 2007, as Bike to Work Day and encouraged member agencies to approve similar proclamations. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.

9. STATUS REPORT ON SENATE BILL 10: AIRPORT AUTHORITY REFORM ACT OF 2007 (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)
Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, reported that in terms of Senate Bill (SB) 10, the staffs and policymakers have had several meetings with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority to coordinate efforts. We are continuing to work with Senator Christine Kehoe and her staff on this bill. The discussions to date have been productive, but questions remain on which agency should prepare and fund the airport land use compatibility plan updates and the new requirement for a regional aviation system plan. We are still meeting to determine how these responsibilities should be assigned.

Chair Sessom added that we continue to follow the Board’s direction to work with the Authority, Senator Kehoe, and others, and staff will bring a back formal position to the full Board in the coming months.

Mayor Jerry Sanders (City of San Diego) thanked the SANDAG Board for allowing the City to continue to work on this. He has met with the SANDAG Chair and two Vice Chairs on this item. He is confident that we will develop a good solution.

Chair Sessom said that Senator Kehoe is asking for SANDAG to take a position on this bill by May.

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

### REPORTS (10 through 16)

10. PROPOSED CHANGES TO OPERATIONS OF FasTrak® PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Councilmember Jack Dale (Santee), Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee, stated that over the past couple of months, the Transportation Committee has directed staff to revise the operations plan for the I-15 FasTrak program. These adjustments will provide the program with the ability to accomplish several policy objectives, including: ensuring facility operations help reduce growing traffic congestion for I-5 commuters, improving our facility’s parity with other toll agencies throughout the state, and establishing a business model that accomplishes three goals: covering the program’s fixed costs, providing incentives for commuters to use the facility, and minimizing impacts to our most active users. The Transportation Committee believes that these adjustments are necessary to both improve the program and provide for the sustainable operations of the facility. He introduced Derek Toups, Manager of the FasTrak program, to provide additional information.

Mr. Toups presented an overview of the program including background, proposed changes, and recommendations. He discussed the I-15 FasTrak value pricing approach, total program costs, fixed contractor costs, and account facts. He also provided information related to SANDAG FasTrak accountholders residing in other counties, and a benchmarking analysis conducted against our closest peers. Mr. Toups presented the Transportation Committee’s proposed business model and gave examples of the account fee proposal from the patron’s perspective.

Mayor Cafagna asked about the current average revenue and asked what these program changes would do to current revenues. Mr. Toups responded that if these changes are
approved, there will be some immediate loss of accounts with the return of transponders; but those are expected to be the least active accounts.

Mayor Pro Tem Judy Ritter (Vista) asked about monitoring the life expectancy of transponders. Mr. Toups said that the usual transponder life expectancy is five years, and we use a series of measures to track activity. We will be doing a mass recall to ensure that all current transponders have a full battery life.

Mayor Desmond asked how this program is going to improve traffic for people on I-15. Mr. Toups replied that this program focuses on use of the I-15 Express lanes, rather than on the general purpose lanes. It is intended to provide another alternative to congested traffic conditions.

Mayor Desmond said that as a user of I-15 it’s difficult to determine whether to use the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes or not. As a driver, what would be an incentive for me to use it, and how much time could I save? If the pricing information could be up on the screen, that would be an incentive to use the system. Mr. Toups stated that we will be going to per-mile pricing as the facility expands, and with the new I-15 Managed Lanes system, we plan to show both the toll and travel time to destinations.

Mr. Gallegos said that if you look at the carrying capacity of a typical freeway lane, an accepted number is 2,000 vehicles per hour. When looking at the I-15 Managed Lanes and the fact that they are carrying HOV with double occupancy and transit, and selling the excess space for single users during peak periods, those same lanes have a carrying capacity of nearly 3,000 people per hour. When compared against general purpose lanes in terms of people movement, Managed Lanes do very well. One of the concerns with this program is that we have been the only agency that hasn’t been charging minimum usage fees for accounts and transponders. The SR 125 toll road will be opening soon, and the proposed program changes will bring us up to parity with the new toll road as well as other peer toll agencies around the state.

Councilmember Dale noted that Commissioner Bixler championed this project when we first started it.

Mayor Cafagna stated that he travels on the I-15 FasTrak lanes every day, and no one drives less than 75 miles per hour (mph). If we made 75 mph the legal speed limit that would be an incentive for drivers to use the lanes.

Councilmember Monroe expressed support for this program. He asked whether the return of unused transponders would save on any of the program costs. Mr. Toups responded that the current contract is not structured to do so. The next contract, which is scheduled to begin in July, will include new policies regarding program maintenance and operations costs per account.

Commissioner Bixler commented that by reducing expenses and raising revenue, the net proceeds are used to fund and make available the Inland Breeze express bus service. To the extent that the program changes work as expected, SANDAG is allowed to increase the Inland Breeze bus service. That is one kind of benefit Mayor Desmond is looking for.
Mayor Cafagna asked if a transponder is still required for each vehicle. He asked how the fees would work if a family has three vehicles and three transponders and actively uses only two transponders. Mr. Toups explained that for that scenario the monthly minimum would be $6 per month less toll fees.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Dale and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the SANDAG Board: (1) approved Resolution No. 2007-20, authorizing staff to update the FasTrak Value Pricing Policy for the I-15 Corridor; and (2) authorized the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding and Fund Transfer Agreement with MTS, in substantially the same form as described in the report, in order to provide I-15 FasTrak funding to support I-15 corridor transit services for FY 2008 to FY 2012. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 98%). No – 1 (San Marcos) (weighted vote, 2%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.

11. **2006 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AUGMENTATION (APPROVE)**

Councilmember Dale stated that this program would add nearly $164 million to high priority highway and transit projects around the region. The recommended projects include: State Route 52 extension to Highway 67, the I-15 South Managed Lanes and Bus Rapid Transit Stations, and improvements to the Blue Line Trolley. The Transportation Committee urged the Board’s approval of this item.

Jose Nuncio, Senior Engineer/Financial Programming, reported that this is a five-year program of projects that is updated every two years. In the past two STIP cycles (2004 and 2006) because of the state budget crisis no new money was added to this program. Proposition 1B, the infrastructure bond measure, included almost $2 billion for the STIP account. This $2 billion will augment the STIP, and we can program these additional dollars to projects. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) provides money for each county. For San Diego County, $163.7 million will be available.

Recommendations taken to the Transportation Committee were consistent with past Board policy: will finish what has been started and will focus on the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and on projects that are ready to go. He showed the options for TransNet EAP highway and transit projects and non-TransNet EAP projects. Mr. Nuncio also requested approval for a funding exchange that will provide a concurrent dollar-for-dollar exchange between STIP, TransNet, and the federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP). This exchange would maintain funding levels approved by the Board for all projects, would improve the alignment between SANDAG and CTC priorities, would reduce the administrative burden, and would get projects that are “ready to go” out to construction sooner. The deadline for submittal to the CTC is April 2, with CTC adoption of the statewide STIP scheduled for June 8.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Dale and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the SANDAG Board approved programming $163.7 million in 2006 STIP Augmentation funding for certain high-priority projects and approved a funding exchange, as detailed in the staff report, to reduce the administrative burden to program these projects. Upon Board approval, staff will award contracts for these projects as soon as they are ready to further accelerate the delivery of these 2006 STIP Augmentation projects. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.
First Vice Chair Pfeiler stated that this item has gone to the Executive Committee over the past three months to develop a draft Overall Work Program (OWP) and associated Budget for the coming fiscal year. We started our discussions by reviewing the agency’s strategic goals and priorities. We looked at specific work elements to advance these goals and to meet our priorities for FY 2008. Each task or product within each work element is aligned with our annual priorities, agency mandates, and interagency commitments.

Tim Watson, Budget Program Manager, provided a budget recap that indicated federal planning funds are down slightly, local sales tax revenues are up slightly, member fees and assessments are unchanged (with the possible exception of Automated Regional Justice Information System [ARJIS] fees to be determined in April), the use of dedicated funds is up 7 percent for FY 2008, and total OWP expenses are up 5.5 percent. He reviewed the proposed focus areas for FY 2008 and a status report on the Contingency Reserve fund.

Mr. Watson presented a compensation proposal that would include a merit pool of 3 percent (down from 4 percent last year), a general salary increase (GSI) of 2 percent, and a proposal to fully fund the agency’s retirement obligation. He described proposed new positions for FY 2008 including one new position, Human Resources Analyst II, two conversions from limited-term to regular, and a conversion of a contract staff position to a regular position. In addition, there are proposed position changes for FY 2007: a Principal Management Internal Auditor and the conversion of two limited-term positions to regular positions. He reviewed the next steps leading to final action on the FY 2008 Budget at the May 25 Board meeting.

Councilmember Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) stated that the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) has embarked on an Orange County Major Investment Study and will be initiating a study of weekend traffic congestion on I-5 from El Toro to the county line with San Diego. She thought we should add our participation in that study to the OWP. This would be consistent with several work elements we already have. It might make sense for us to piggyback on the OCTA weekend traffic congestion study. Study results would allow us to improve COASTER scheduling on the weekend.

Councilmember Gallo asked if there had been any thought or discussion about outsourcing new positions. Renée Wasmund, Director of Finance, replied that we use limited-term positions so we are not limiting ourselves to funding ongoing staff expenses year to year. When it is determined that a position is needed on an ongoing basis, consideration is made to convert it into a regular position. Limited term positions are “at will” employees.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) commented that he and Chair Sessom (on behalf of SANDAG) attended a conference recently with information about the concept of reducing greenhouse gases. The Governor is embracing this concept, which means that local jurisdictions also will have to embrace this concept. About 41 percent of greenhouse gases are created by vehicles, and in San Diego County it is 50 percent. He asked that at some point in the future a discussion of greenhouse gases be brought to the Executive Committee.
Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) noted that he also attended that same presentation. We ought to have an informed presentation at this Board. There is a lack of understanding of what is going on in California.

Supervisor Roberts expressed concern about the salary proposal that includes an automatic step increase. He doesn’t like to see that in budgets, and he asked that the Board be provided specific information on which jurisdictions have step increases. He stated that the County reviews salary ranges on an annual basis and makes adjustments to the ranges, but does not approve an across-the-board increase in the ranges.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler stated that SANDAG is one of the only agencies that has a merit pool, not a step increase. There is a recommendation for a 2 percent across-the-board general salary increase. The merit increase is not an automatic step increase. There is a salary range and periodically, the range may be increased; however, there is no an automatic salary increase.

Mayor Mark Lewis (El Cajon) asked why we are looking at an internal auditor position rather than an outside auditor. Ms. Wasmund responded that we have external auditors that perform audits on an annual basis. However, they are precluded from doing the type of work that this person would perform. Having an internal auditor can help improve our project delivery. We currently are required to undergo pre-award audits for our major consultant contracts and have to wait for Caltrans’ internal auditors to conduct audits of our consultant contracts. We think we can use an internal auditor for that purpose and turn around the pre-award audit much quicker than the current Caltrans’ turnaround time of five to seven months.

Mayor Mark Lewis asked if this is acceptable to Caltrans. Second Vice Chair Jerome Stocks replied that it is acceptable to Caltrans. We wanted to make sure we were not replacing true independent audits. We are including internal improvements to our process.

Mayor Madrid asked if the other large councils of governments (COGs) have internal auditors. Mr. Gallegos said he didn’t know but would check on that. All COGs are different. One reason for this position is that we have gotten into project implementation. Other transit agencies have internal auditors that do this kind of work. We also want to make sure our internal processes are working.

Mayor Madrid suggested that we obtain Caltrans’ agreement in writing that allows SANDAG to use an internal auditor for the pre-award audit work. He noted that if you can cut five months from a project’s schedule, you can save a significant amount of money.

Supervisor Roberts asked if there is a survey that shows how many cities have automatic salary step increases and indicates the limits on the steps themselves. Mr. Gallegos answered that many of the area cities have been polled. One challenge is that a lot of the cities and the County are negotiating with their labor unions and may not want to release information about salary increases.

Supervisor Roberts asked how many area jurisdictions have automatic step increases today. First Vice Chair Pfeiler stated that SANDAG is different from the cities in that it doesn’t have an automatic step increase process.
Supervisor Roberts said he was asking about the automatic increase in the limits of the salary ranges.

Mayor Cafagna commented that if there was no room in a classification range, an employee would stay at the same pay rate. If there is room in the salary range, then a merit increase can be paid.

Ms. Wasmund said that the salary range only increases if the GSI is approved. The SANDAG Board has approved a 2 percent GSI over the past two years.

Supervisor Roberts reiterated that the salary range limit goes up with the cost of living increases.

Chair Sessom stated that staff will bring this matter back.

Supervisor Roberts also asked for a list of the cities that have this automatic step increase salary program.

Supervisor Horn explained that at the County a vote is required to increase a salary range. He wondered how many jurisdictions have an automatic override on the salary range.

Councilmember Monroe said that if he was an employee at the top of his/her salary range, he would not receive a merit increase unless the range is changed. First Vice Chair Pfeiler agreed that was correct.

Supervisor Roberts said that the County does not approve an automatic increase for all of the ranges, they are increased individually as needed.

**Action:** Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Crawford, the SANDAG Board approved: (1) the Draft FY 2008 Budget, including the OWP, (2) the hiring of an internal auditor position and conversion of two limited-term positions to regular positions in FY 2007, and (3) directed staff to report back with information on the salary process of the area jurisdictions as it relates to automatic step/salary range increases. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.

13. **LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE FUNDING (APPROVE)**

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner, reported that this item is a request for additional funding to complete construction of the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge. The bridge will provide an alternative route for bicyclists that now have to cross I-15. It would be the only access for pedestrians. This project is included in the regional bicycle corridor network in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan. The bridge will be 990 feet long and is a stress ribbon bridge with only two piers in the water. He reviewed the cost estimate and revenues. To date, SANDAG has provided $2.5 million for this project. About $4.5 million of state funding for this bridge will be lost if a construction contract is not awarded by June of this year. This project was reviewed by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Working Group and the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC). The ITOC suggested approval with
conditions. The Transportation Committee recommended approval of this request with concerns about the level of contingency funding for this project.

Chair Sessom noted that there were several requests to speak.

Maryam Babaki, Chair of ITOC, noted that this issue was heard last Wednesday. Following discussion the members suggested conditions of approval: SANDAG should be actively involved in project oversight starting with the bid process, staff should document the action on this issue regarding impacts on the use TransNet funds, and staff should provide quarterly progress reports on the bridge construction process.

Dick Bobertz, Executive Director, San Dieguito River Park, stated that when they started this project they wanted to link the trail system between two areas and realized it was a regional project. They have struggled with increased construction materials costs. He expressed gratitude for the role of SANDAG in keeping this project alive. He understood that SANDAG will be in a major funding position in this project, and if the low bid comes in over the funds allotted, he will have to seek funding elsewhere. When they went through the analysis with SANDAG staff engineers, they indicated some problem with the total cost of the project as estimated. We don’t have a large contingency reserve for four reasons: the estimate usually includes 6 percent administrative cost, the current estimate is based on a detailed analysis of the rejected bid so we’re able to fine-tune the cost estimate, we have information that we will have more than one bidder, and we are sensitive to cutting costs. If you take this action, it will facilitate your Bike to Work Day program through Escondido and the west Rancho Bernardo area.

Kathy Keehan, Executive Director of the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, spoke in support of the staff recommendation. This project will provide a crucial link. Currently, there is a 25-mile detour around Lake Hodges. This project meets the goals that SANDAG set in terms of funding transportation projects in the region. It is contained in the plans and provides routine accommodation. It is ready to go to construction. This project leverages almost $5 million in outside money into this county.

Mayor Cafagna supported this project as it is a crucial link. It is important for us as we are building the bicycle corridor that we analyze the usage to see how this kind of project is attracting and increasing bicycle traffic. He was surprised we didn’t include this project in the expansion of I-15 work. We should analyze that in the future to provide for pedestrian and bicycle necessities as part of major corridor-widening efforts.

Mayor Mark Lewis asked if the bridge will be lit at night and how will emergency vehicles be able to respond to an accident half way across the bridge. Mr. Vance responded that the bridge does not include lighting. Emergency access is a structural question. Mr. Bobertz added that lighting was taken off as a cost-cutting measure. The bridge will only be open during daylight hours. The south bridge abutment adjoins West Bernardo Drive, and it is a 10-foot-wide bridge so an accident victim could be picked up either by an emergency vehicle or by foot by emergency personnel.

Mayor Madrid asked who will maintain and operate this project. Mr. Vance replied that the River Park will be the owner and operator of the bridge.
Captain Michael Giorgione (Department of Defense) said the first issue is whether we really need this bridge. It appears we bought a design and put it out on the street. He wondered why this project was not attached to an existing project. He asked how the River Park conducted its market survey to achieve only one bid. He thought that perhaps SANDAG should go with a design/build process. He asked if the bridge is made from concrete. He noted that there are a number of innovative ways to build a project.

Mr. Vance said that the project has already received its environmental clearance and is ready to go. The issue of attaching to an existing bridge came up at the ITOC meeting this week and at some point there was some consideration of that, but the price to go back and add it now would not be feasible. Steel and concrete prices were high last summer. SANDAG has not been directly involved in the project development.

Captain Giorgione asked Mr. Bobertz if he felt comfortable that the right people bid on the project the first time. Susan Carter, Project Manager, said that when they went out to bid they had a wide net. There was a lot of interest among potential bidders, but in the end there was only one. We have begun a portion of the bridge construction. This funding will get us into the next phase. We did consider attaching this project to the existing I-15 bridge, but that idea was rejected by Caltrans and other parties. It would be difficult now to start over.

Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside) commented that this is an important regional project, and we should move forward with it. We have a lot of other bike trails being proposed and should look at these issues in the future.

Councilmember McCoy supported this project. She mentioned that we also have to look at the hidden costs related to health.

Councilmember Gallo stated that he supported this project, and we have been working on this project for eight years. Rising costs have been one issue. We now have the opportunity to get this project completed.

Captain Giorgione noted that there are other projects on the list to be built. Mr. Vance said that we are involved in several regionally significant projects. We are taking advantage of the kinds of things that were suggested. We are about to embark on development of a regional bicycle plan. One effort will be to identify the corridors and to develop bicycle projects in conjunction with other SANDAG transportation projects.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler said she was pleased to be able to move forward with this project, but she clarified that SANDAG does not have any more money for this project.

Supervisor Horn moved approval and said that the action on this item will include the conditions from the ITOC.

Captain Giorgione asked about design-build contracts. Mr. Gallegos stated that we haven’t been successful in getting state approval to use all the project procurement methods (e.g., design build) that the Department of Defense has current authority to use.
Mayor Cheryl Cox (Chula Vista) suggested that the Board consider a report on the Bayshore Bikeway.

Mr. Gallegos said that there will be a cost to conduct project oversight on the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge. Staff will report back on the cost for that work.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Horn and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the SANDAG Board approved an additional $1.875 million in FY 2009 TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety funds for the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge, with the conditions suggested by the ITOC. The allocation would be subject to the establishment of an appropriate agreement between Escondido (the pass-through local agency) and the San Dieguito River Park covering the administration of the TransNet grant funding. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – None.

14. **BUDGET INCREASE FOR AUTOMATED FARE COLLECTION PROJECT (APPROVE)**

James Dreisbach-Towle, Automated Fare Collection Project Manager, presented a project overview with main goals: to make transit payments as simple as possible and easy to use for our patrons, to improve the information and revenue flow for our transit operators, and to develop future payment options. He reviewed the project scope with a focus on developing a universal “smart card” system. This project has been developed with three different implementation phases: Phase 1 is for NCTD/San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) buses; Phase 2 is for rail (Trolley, COASTER, and SPRINTER), and Phase 3 is for MTS contract buses.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle said that we will start some pilot programs, and he asked the Board’s help in testing the smart card product, known as Compass Card. In 2005, we deployed electronic validating fareboxes collecting cash, coin, and tokens, and we are now ready for the smart card operation. We have installed equipment that is smart-card compliant. This new system will allow travel anywhere in the county with a single payment option. Machines will vend tickets, add value, and validate the smart cards. Patrons would only need to bring a smart card within an inch of the reader, and it doesn’t have to be removed from a pocket or purse. Code enforcement officers have handheld devices for enforcement purposes. We have purchased point-of-sale equipment for the transit stores. He noted that we have a Web system as well.

Mr. Dreisbach-Towle reviewed the project schedule. He said that final system acceptance is scheduled for May 2007. Many of the Board and staff are already transit system users. Before public launch of the system, we will have several pilot programs and survey results. We will replace the paper transit passes, and it will take 12 to 18 months to do this.

He stated that we had a very aggressive schedule that the contractor was unable to meet. This item is requesting a budget increase to fund the transition cost, staff time, administrative time, and consultant costs to complete the project. The increase will be funded through $700,000 in bond interest. The MTS Board has authorized the use of that bond interest for this project. There also is $2.8 million in STIP Augmentation funds, which was approved today as part of another agenda item. He noted that staff will come back with a project update in the summer.
Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Wood and a second by Second Vice Chair Stocks, the SANDAG Board approved an increase in the budget for the Automated Fare Collection Project, known as the Compass Card Project, in order to complete the project and fund the settlement with Cubic approved by the Board. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – La Mesa.

15. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: INITIAL REVENUE CONSTRAINED AND REASONABLY EXPECTED REVENUE SCENARIOS (INFORMATION)

Mike Hix, Principal Planner, reported that in preparing for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) staff prepared the Unconstrained Revenue Network, which represents the region’s needs for transit, highway, and arterial improvements, and operations to meet travel demand in 2030. Recognizing that transportation funds are limited, the Unconstrained Revenue Network establishes the baseline for identifying two funding scenarios that will build, operate, and maintain as much of the network as possible, given revenue availability, flexibility, and project commitments. The two funding scenarios are the Revenue Constrained scenario, which is limited to traditional funding sources, and the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario, a more aggressive approach that includes additional funding. The MOBILITY 2030 RTP was based on a Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

Mr. Hix said that the updated Revenue Constrained scenario is $40.6 billion, including projected revenues from the state transportation infrastructure bond measure (Proposition 1B). This scenario remains intact from the previous RTP and includes the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP). He and Linda Culp, Senior Planner, reviewed the changes to highway and transit projects included in the 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP compared with the proposed projects in the 2007 RTP Revenue Constrained scenario. A preliminary analysis indicates that without modifying the projects included in the previous Revenue Constrained scenario, future revenues appear to be about $2 billion short to complete all of the projects. This increase is due to rising costs in construction and rights-of-way.

The philosophy for creating both the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios is to focus on priority corridor investments, improvements in those corridors, and to incorporate other high-ranking improvements throughout the region. Individual project priorities are determined using objective evaluation criteria to rank each category of RTP improvements: transit, highways, HOV/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) connectors, direct freeway connectors, and goods movement projects.

Mr. Hix stated that two investment scenarios are suggested for consideration as part of the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario: (1) increase the investment by about $4 billion, and (2) increase the investment to $10 billion. The initial options for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected scenarios have been created through collaboration among the staffs at SANDAG, Caltrans, and the transit agencies, as well as review and input from stakeholder groups, the Transportation Committee, and the Board. Based on these discussions, staff will bring back specific Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue networks along with performance measures to the Transportation Committee and Board in April.
Mr. Hix indicated that the MOBILITY 2030 RTP adopted in 2003 assumed the extension of TransNet, additional state and federal gas taxes, and additional state and federal discretionary revenues, as new sources of funding for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. The TransNet extension monies were included in the adopted 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP and also are included in the 2007 RTP Revenue Constrained scenario. Unfortunately, the TransNet funding gain has been offset by rising project costs and lower-than-expected revenues from the state and federal sources. As a result, the limited resources in the 2007 Revenue Constrained scenario would not provide all of the planned improvements identified in the region’s priority corridors.

If additional funds were available, the investment strategy would be to finish the high-priority corridor improvements and to package complementary projects. There are choices on where to apply additional funds: a balanced distribution option and options for either a highway or transit emphasis. The first option for available revenues would be a $4 billion balanced approach with $2 billion for highway and $2 billion for transit improvements. A second option would be about $10 billion, again with a balanced approach between highway and transit improvements.

Mr. Hix stated that over the past several months, a variety of new sources of local transportation funding for expanded RTP investments have been discussed. The sources that fared well with the public were 62 percent in favor of another quarter cent sales tax, a nonresidential development impact fee, and an increase in the vehicle license fee. The Board indicated a willingness to consider toll facilities, nonresidential development impact fees, parking assessment districts, an increase in the vehicle license fee, and a fee for shipping containers at the seaports and border crossings. At the March 16, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting, there was strong opposition to any inference that SANDAG showed any support for an additional sales tax for regional transportation facilities. Staff is suggesting that SANDAG first focus on determining the level of investment, if any, above the $40.6 billion Revenue Constrained Plan for the 2007 RTP.

Mr. Hix indicated that staff is requesting direction on the development of the draft networks related to the commitment to the TransNet EAP as the basis for the Revenue Constrained Plan, use the project evaluation results as the basis for the priority ranking, determine a level of investment for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario, and confirm a balanced investment approach in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

Chair Sessom said that some Board members did not receive this report so it will be treated as a discussion item today.

Chair Sessom noted that there were several requests to speak on this item.

Kathy Keehan, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, commented that staff has done an excellent job in outlining the issues. She wondered given these levels of costs if we are spending the money in the places we should. We cannot build our way out of traffic congestion. Spending money on highways rather than transit is a concern. The proposal is a balanced approach, but she feels that we are losing money on the transit side. We are not investing enough in transit, transit is not meeting the needs, and we need to do better. She hopes that when the Board looks at the evaluation criteria it also will include criteria related to reduction in air quality emissions and greenhouse gases.
Clive Richard, a member of the public, said that he attended the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group meeting, and the discussion was about spending as much as we do on highways. He shared thoughts that we are rapidly becoming a one-person, one-car region. It seems to him that while it is politically easier to build freeways, ultimately we leave our children the heritage for these actions.

Mayor Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach) expressed appreciation for Ms. Keehan’s comments. She was distressed to see how much was proposed for highway improvements and the lack of projects in the North County area. She wondered if there is any consideration for transit service level improvements and transit infrastructure improvements. She agreed with the concerns regarding air quality improvements.

Supervisor Roberts asked for information on proposed improvements to SR 67. Mr. Hix responded that improvements to SR 67 are not included in the Revenue Constrained Plan. Staff is going to look at how that project ranks in the analysis using the Board-approved evaluation criteria. Mr. Gallegos said that this project is currently in the Unconstrained Revenue scenario. As we run through the project evaluation criteria, we will be able to bring all of the projects back to the Board for review.

Supervisor Roberts asked that SANDAG respond to the letter he received from Supervisor Dianne Jacob regarding SR 67. Mr. Gallegos agreed to that request.

Mayor Cox suggested that the Board consider a funding option that is one-third highway, one-third transit, and one-third local streets.

Mayor Bud Lewis (Carlsbad) expressed concern about the lack of parking for two COASTER line stations in Carlsbad. We are looking at drastic measures on how to resolve parking issues. There doesn’t appear to be any project related to resolving these parking challenges. It seems that nothing will be done in his area for 10 years. He hoped that SANDAG will try to get money for the parking situation. NCTD has land available that a parking garage could be built on.

Ms. Culp noted that Attachment 5 lists by time period the major capital projects, and transit parking structures are included there. We do have funds in each time period for those projects. The short-term period is 2005-2010.

Mayor Bud Lewis said that timing is not fast enough.

Commissioner Mike Bixler complimented staff on the report. He didn’t see any real thought in this report of establishing a freight transit right-of-way from San Diego Bay inland to the Otay Mesa area. As manufacturing expands in the area, now is the time to talk seriously about right-of-way for freight, transit, and bike paths that might be established before this area gets built up.

Second Vice Chair Stocks was gratified to hear of the commitment to acquire parking in downtown Carlsbad. The NCTD Board has a priority where they want to look at projects that could go on their properties. However, since they are not all transit projects, they have to go through the cities along the COASTER and SPRINTER corridors.
Mayor Cafagna suggested working on public/private partnerships for parking garages. He agreed that we don’t have adequate parking facilities for our transit stations.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that we have two active transit-oriented projects in development. The first one is at the Grossmont Trolley Station in La Mesa, and that project has broken ground. The second is at the Solana Beach COASTER station, and the Solana Beach City Council is considering the Environmental Impact Report for that project.

Councilmember Crawford, Chair of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, noted there was a very good discussion of this item on Tuesday. That discussion showed a noticeable increase in sensitivity to and concern for future planning, and a growing desire to see us include transit alternatives in this RTP update. She summarized the comments made at the last Working Group meeting: concerns about the existing headways for current transit services; the increased cost of gasoline and the impact to the environment from building more roads; overemphasis on highways and underfunding improvements for smart growth, environment, etc.; and the need to use 21st century technology to make public transit more user friendly with more information signage at bus stops, providing additional shelters, and increasing trip frequency to make transit a more workable option for daily activities. She stated that the Working Group members do not believe the SANDAG Board is going to change the way SANDAG is planning for the future.

Chair Sessom stated that one thing that staff is looking for today is direction on two investment-level options for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) said that to increase transit ridership, we need to increase density. He asked about transit projects that are not in the Revenue Constrained scenario. Ms. Culp replied that several transit projects were moved to the Reasonably Expected Scenario.

Councilmember Gallo said that we have to be more cognizant of the I-8 area. We will have more and more people on this freeway commuting from Imperial County.

Mayor Wood acknowledged that there is only so much money, and he is impressed with the San Diego region as whole. The only negative is the traffic. He wondered about a light rail connection from Riverside County to San Diego County, with a possible connection to the SPRINTER. That would help take traffic off of the freeways in the North County area.

Councilmember Dale pointed out the increased cost of construction due to the cost of materials. We are restrained by the source of the money and the commitments that have already been made.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that both options be kept on the table, and staff will bring back more detail at the next meeting. Almost everything staff is proposing is to better manage the freeway systems to meet demands; not to pit the modes against each other but to allow them to work together. If we manage correctly, there is room for various types of modes. Staff is trying to implement the land use and transportation vision that is set in the Regional Comprehensive Plan.
Councilmember Crawford suggested that there needs to be a better understanding in the presentation of information about how the Managed Lanes will work for both highways and transit, and how they will relate with each other.

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

16. FY 2007 BUDGET AMENDMENT: CALIFORNIA REGIONAL BLUEPRINT PLANNING PROGRAM (APPROVE)

There was no discussion on this item.

**Action**: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Pfeiler and a second by Mayor Cafagna, the SANDAG Board approved an amendment to the FY 2007 Program Budget and Overall Work Program to accept a $200,000 California Regional Blueprint Planning Grant to continue Regional Comprehensive Plan implementation activities. Action by the Board would adjust current Work Element No. 30060 (California Blueprint Planning Program) and provide the required $50,000 local match as part of the FY 2008 Program Budget. Yes – 13 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (0%). Absent – Carlsbad, Chula Vista, County of San Diego, La Mesa, City of San Diego, and Solana Beach.

17. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Business meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled at 9 a.m. on Friday, April 27, 2007.

18. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:22 p.m.
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ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board meeting.

BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (March 23, 2007)

The Borders Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved the Final Draft Report for Phase II of the I-15 Interregional Partnership, and forwarded it to the SANDAG Board of Directors for final approval.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 6, 2007)

The Transportation Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved Resolution No. 2007-22 increasing the FY 2007 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim for the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) by $8,000.

- Approved a transfer of $90,000 from the Metropolitan Transit System Capital Needs Assessment Project to the LRT (Light Rail Transit) Shelter Replacement Project, thus increasing the LRT Shelter Replacement Project budget to $896,716.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (APRIL 6, 2007)

The Regional Planning Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved an amendment to the Energy Working Group (EWG) Charter that would expand the EWG membership from 22 to 25 members, institute an attendance policy, and make technical edits to the charter. The three new member categories are an Independent Power Producer, San Diego Renewable Energy Society, and the South County Economic Development Council.

- Recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with the California Coastal Commission to establish a process for the administration of the newly established Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund.
Recommended that the Executive Committee amend the FY 2007 Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget to accept $150,000 in funding from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) for preparation of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the San Diego region, and authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into the revenue agreement with DBW, and procure a consultant for the plan’s development.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (April 13, 2007)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

• Approved an amendment to the FY 2007 OWP and Budget to accept $150,000 in funding from DBW, and authorized the Executive Director to enter a revenue agreement with DBW and procure a consultant for development of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan.

• Recommended that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2007 Budget to change the classification of a Senior Transportation Planner position (Class No. 22) to Goods Movement Policy Manager (Class No. 30), and to authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the San Diego Unified Port District.

• Provided comments on potential amendments to Senate Bill 10: San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Reform Act of 2007, and requested that staff report back at the May 11, 2007, Executive Committee meeting for possible action on the bill.

• Discussed a proposal by Poway Mayor Mickey Cafagna on proposed state legislation for increasing housing production in the San Diego region through regional contribution agreements, and requested that the proposal be referred to the Regional Planning Commission for further discussion.

• Approved the agenda for the April 27, 2007, SANDAG Board of Directors meeting, as amended.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 20, 2007)

The Transportation Committee is being asked to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Adopt Resolution No. 2007-23 approving Amendment No. 4 to the 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program RTIP.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG submittal of proposals for the Urban Partnership Agreement and other supporting grant opportunities.

• Recommend the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios to the Board of Directors for use in the Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

• Recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors one of the funding options outlined in the staff report for implementation of State Route 52 Freeway Extension project.
The Public Safety Committee is being asked to take the following actions or to recommend the following approvals:

- Review and accept the FY 2008 Public Safety work program and budget, including proposed increase in Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) fees, and recommend that the Board of Directors accept the Public Safety work program and budget as part of the final SANDAG FY 2008 Overall Work Program and Budget.

Staff will update the SANDAG Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation Committee and Public Safety Committee at their meetings on April 20, 2007, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
Introduction

In 1996, SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission (Commission) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that outlines the administration responsibilities for the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund. In October 2005, the Commission approved the Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund and has requested that SANDAG also administer this new fund.

Discussion

Background

The Beach Sand Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the Commission through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of approval. The fee is assessed to mitigate the adverse impacts of shoreline protective structures, such as seawalls and revetments, on beaches within the region.

Recently, the Commission set up a Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund (PRBIM Fund), which consists of fees collected by the Commission as mitigation for the adverse impacts on public recreational use of the beaches within the region. The PRBIM Fund is a separate fund from the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund. Monies from the PRBIM Fund will be solely used to implement projects that provide public recreational improvements that may include, but are not limited to, public beach accessways, blufftop access, viewing areas, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail amenities.

SANDAG was not involved with the decision to create these funds and has no influence over the level of mitigation required by the Commission. The role of SANDAG is to collect funds mandated by the Commission and hold the money in an interest-bearing account. SANDAG staff keeps track of the funds collected for each local jurisdiction and, when a local jurisdiction requests the use of funds, works with the local jurisdiction staff to process the request. The use of funds requires local jurisdiction, Commission, and SANDAG approval.

This item was discussed at the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG), where action was taken at the March 1, 2007, meeting to recommend to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) that SANDAG administer the PRBIM Fund. The RPC discussed this item at its April, 6, 2007, meeting and
approved a recommendation to the SANDAG Board that would authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into an MOA with the Commission to administer the PRBIM Fund.

**Next Steps**

SANDAG staff will work with the Commission to finalize the MOA based on the Board’s input. Once the MOA has been signed, staff will coordinate with the Commission on the administration and oversight of this fund. Additionally, staff will work closely with the coastal jurisdictions on the use of funds, providing information and guidance as necessary.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Agreement between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #8002800
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
ESTABLISHING A PROCESS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
PUBLIC RECREATIONAL BEACH IMPACT MITIGATION FUND

WHEREAS, the Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the California Coastal Commission ("Commission") through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of various permits, as mitigation for the adverse impacts on public recreational use of the beaches within San Diego County from development along the beach or shoreline including but not limited to, shoreline protective structures such as seawalls, revetments, and bluff retaining walls; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation fees are deposited in an interest-bearing account created at the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG"), with all interest earned payable to the account for the purposes stated below; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the account is to establish a Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund ("Fund") to aid local governments, working cooperatively through SANDAG and the Commission, in providing recreational improvements designed to enhance public recreational beach use within San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, the funds shall be solely used to implement projects that provide public recreational improvements which may include but are not limited to, public beach accessways, blufftop access, viewing areas, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail amenities, and not to fund operation, research, maintenance, or planning studies; and

WHEREAS, the Fund shall be allocated as provided for in this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between SANDAG and the Commission, setting forth terms and conditions to ensure that the mitigation fees will be expended in the manner intended by the Commission.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Fund Administration

The Commission and SANDAG agree that the mitigation fees collected will be held by SANDAG in a trust fund maintained and operated by SANDAG, and known as the Fund. However, SANDAG agrees to establish a separate accounting for monies within the Fund for each coastal jurisdiction in the San Diego County region. Mitigation fees collected from approved shoreline projects within each coastal jurisdiction shall be accounted for by jurisdiction.

Money from a coastal jurisdiction’s account cannot be spent without having that local jurisdiction’s formal approval through resolution by city council or Board of Supervisors.

The money in the Fund shall be invested by SANDAG in accordance with applicable law. Income and/or interest shall be credited to each coastal jurisdiction’s account on a prorated basis. A copy of the accounting review shall be submitted annually, upon completion, to the Executive Director of the Commission ("Executive Director").
Up to a maximum of 15 hours at a rate not greater than $105.00 per hour (loaded rate) per request will be used to reimburse SANDAG staff time. Reimbursement will occur when funds are allocated. Reimbursable activities include but are not limited to the preparation of agendas, reports, presentations at meetings, and other necessary activities in support of fund allocation. Reimbursement will be taken from funds reserved for the local jurisdiction(s) requesting fund allocation and should be included in a jurisdiction’s formal funding approval.

2. Fund Allocation

The Commission and SANDAG agree that the Commission and the region’s coastal jurisdictions, working together with the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, shall evaluate proposed public recreational improvement projects and will recommend how much, if any, money from the fund should be allocated to a project and how much of the total allocation should come from each jurisdiction’s account. No funds shall be allocated from a local jurisdiction’s account without the jurisdiction’s formal approval through a resolution by the relevant city council or Board of Supervisors.

The Commission and SANDAG agree that, prior to allocation of any funds, the recommendation of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, as well as recommendation for approval by the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee and approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, must be submitted to the Commission’s Executive Director for review and approval. The Commission’s Executive Director must provide written concurrence with each allocation before any allocation occurs.

The Commission and SANDAG agree that each disbursement shall only be made to the recipient with conditions that guarantee that the disbursement is issued as intended by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and approved by SANDAG and the Commission’s Executive Director. Any portion of the disbursement that is not used shall be returned to the Fund and accounted for in the contributing coastal jurisdiction’s account(s) on a pro-rated basis.

3. Eligible Projects

Only projects which meet all of the following criteria will be considered by the Commission, the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, and SANDAG for funding:

a. Projects that are recommended by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and approved by SANDAG, the Commission’s Executive Director, and formal action of the relevant local coastal jurisdiction(s), may be considered for funding.

b. Projects that involve public shorefront recreational improvements for beach and beach-related public access, which may include but are not limited to, public beach access stairways/ramps, blufftop access, viewing areas, public benches/bicycle racks, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail improvements, in San Diego County will be considered for funding. Because the fees that will go into the Fund are intended to mitigate for the loss of and/or impact to public recreational beach value resulting from construction of shoreline protective structures or other forms of development that have adverse effects on the beach or shoreline, only projects that provide public recreational improvements shall be supported by the Fund.
c. Projects must be capital projects to be considered for funding. Mitigation fees shall not be used for operations, research, maintenance, or planning studies. The Shoreline Preservation Working Group may recommend that funds be allocated to engineering or permitting (e.g., environmental documentation) costs directly related to the implementation of a capital project, under limited circumstances, and only if necessary to secure supplemental funds from another source.

d. Projects must obtain Coastal Act authorization from the local government having jurisdiction, and/or the Commission, prior to initiation of construction.

4. Use of Project Funds

The Commission and SANDAG agree that mitigation fees generated within a coastal jurisdiction shall be used only for projects affecting that same coastal jurisdiction but may include regional projects that span and affect multiple jurisdictions.

It is the intent of the parties to this MOA to ensure consistency in the administration and allocation of mitigation fees from the Public Beach Recreational Impact Mitigation Fund.

Projects may be carried out by the local jurisdictions themselves, by other agencies, including, but not limited to, the Army Corps of Engineers, the United States Navy, the California Coastal Conservancy, the California Department of Parks and Recreation or the California Department of Boating and Waterways, and/or non-profit organizations. Any third party selected to carry out a project using the Public Beach Recreational Impact Mitigation Fund shall agree to defend, indemnify and hold the Commission and SANDAG, their respective officers, directors, staff, agents, and member agencies harmless from any and all liability, claims, damages or injuries to any person or property arising from or connected with a project funded under this MOA.


This MOA may be altered, changed or amended by mutual consent of the parties hereto. Either party may terminate this MOA by providing written notification 30 days prior to termination.

In the event of termination of this MOA by either party, any and all remaining funds shall be transferred by SANDAG to the Commission or a Commission-approved alternate entity consistent with the principles set forth in this MOA.

For purposes of this MOA, the relationship of the parties is that of independent entities and not as agents of each other or as joint venturers or partners. The parties shall maintain sole and exclusive control over their personnel, agents, consultants, and operations.

Nothing in the provisions of this MOA is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights in third parties to this MOA or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOA.

This MOA shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. If any action is brought to interpret or enforce any term of this MOA, the action shall be brought in a state or federal court situated in the County of San Diego, State of California.
REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Introduction

Board Policy Nos. 003, 017 and 024 require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis.

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003


Board Policy No. 017

Board Policy No. 017, “Delegation of Authority,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board certain actions taken at the next regular meeting. The policy authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance. There were no budget transfers or amendments that were approved under the Executive Director’s authority since the report made last month.

Board Policy No. 017 further requires the Executive Director to report any final determinations to persons or firms filing a protest regarding SANDAG procurement or contracting processes or procedures. On March 23, 2007, AUTOLIFT Services submitted a protest in reference to the North County Transit District (NCTD) East Division Facility Expansion Rebid, Project BUS-1142300, Contract No. 5000488. The SANDAG Contract Administrator appointed a Protest Committee. By letter dated April 5, 2007, the Protest Committee denied the protest, finding no merit in the protest. The Protest Committee’s recommendation letter was sustained by the SANDAG Chief Executive Deputy Director. No request for reconsideration of the denial was made by the protestor.

Board Policy No. 024

Board Policy No. 024, “Procurement and Contracting-Construction”, requires the Executive Director to report to the Board the granting of (1) Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility and (2) Acceptance of Work for construction contracts. The following actions are reported in accordance with this policy:
• On February 28, 2007, Geofon, Inc. was granted Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility and Acceptance of the Work for the Imperial Avenue Division Underground Storage Tanks Repair project. The project was completed on time and within the contract amount of $724,564.

• On February 13, 2007, HMS Construction, Inc. was granted Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility for the Yard Traction Power Substation project. Acceptance has not been granted yet.

• On March 8, 2007, Moore Electrical Contracting, Inc. was granted Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility for the Fiber-Optic Network Installation project. Acceptance has not been granted yet.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director


Key Staff Contact: Renée Wasmund, (619) 699-1940, rwa@sandag.org
MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Amount on Cost</th>
<th>Yield on Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>$28,363.98</td>
<td>$28,099.79</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>226,882.10</td>
<td>224,779.34</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>32,693.61</td>
<td>32,389.09</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>277,632.40</td>
<td>275,059.28</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>52,242.88</td>
<td>51,756.27</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>454,234.44</td>
<td>450,024.55</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>7,699.53</td>
<td>7,627.81</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2007</td>
<td>04/02/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN DISC NOTES</td>
<td>120,251.06</td>
<td>119,136.56</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOUGHT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td>$1,188,872.69</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATURED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/2007</td>
<td>02/15/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LOAN BKS TAP NOTES</td>
<td>2,385,000.00</td>
<td>2,429,361.00</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/2007</td>
<td>02/20/2007</td>
<td>FEDERAL NATIONAL MTG ASSN NOTES (CALLABLE)</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MATURED:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,385,000.00</td>
<td>$3,429,361.00</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN:
DRAFT REVENUE CONSTRAINED AND REASONABLY
EXPECTED REVENUE SCENARIOS

Introduction

In developing the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Unconstrained Network represents the region’s needs for transit, highway, and arterial improvements, and operations to meet travel demand in 2030. The Unconstrained Network establishes the baseline for identifying two funding scenarios that will build, operate, and maintain as much of the network as possible, given revenue availability, flexibility, and project commitments. The two funding scenarios are Revenue Constrained, limited to traditional funding sources, and Reasonably Expected Revenue, a more aggressive scenario that includes additional funding. The MOBILITY 2030 RTP, adopted in 2003, was based on a Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

The updated “baseline revenue” forecast for the Revenue Constrained scenario is $40.6 billion, and an initial Revenue Constrained list of projects was proposed in March 2007. Once the final highway and transit project rankings were available, staff evaluated potential changes to the list that did not impact projects in the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP). The only change proposed is adding two high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes from the number one ranked project, Interstate 5 (I-5) between La Jolla Village Drive and I-8, in place of two much lower ranked projects: the widening of SR 56 and the HOV lanes on SR 125 between SR 54 and SR 94.

In March, the Board directed staff to analyze two investment level options for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios. The first option would increase the investment by approximately $4 billion above the baseline revenue forecast to a total of $45 billion, and the second option would increase it by $10 billion to a total of $51 billion. For the $51 billion option, staff created scenarios based on a balanced approach between highway and transit investments, and with a highway or transit emphasis. Using the project rankings, SANDAG staff created networks and ran initial forecasts for each scenario.

Transportation Committee Action

At its April 20, 2007, meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended Option 2A, a $51 billion level of investment with the $10 billion increment above the Revenue Constrained Scenario balanced between highway and transit projects and services.
In addition, the Transportation Committee recommended several other options be included that would bring the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario total to $58 billion. The additional options include building the Managed Lanes on I-5 and I-15 north of Oceanside and Escondido as toll roads ($2 billion), adding a $3 billion package of separately funded Goods Movement projects, and an additional $2 billion in revenues for local agency transportation improvements. Board acceptance of specific draft Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios in April would keep the RTP on schedule for a draft document in June 2007 and a final RTP in November 2007.

Discussion

Because of the recent rising costs in construction and right-of-way acquisition, the draft 2007 Revenue Constrained scenario includes reduced levels of improvements in several corridors in comparison to the 2006 Revenue Constrained Plan but allows the overall corridor investment strategy to remain intact. The philosophy in going beyond the Revenue Constrained scenario by creating a more robust Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario as the preferred plan for the 2007 RTP is the ability to complete the investments in our priority corridors and be able to incorporate other high-ranking improvements throughout the region. Individual project priorities were determined using objective evaluation criteria to rank each category of RTP improvements: transit, highways, HOV/bus rapid transit (BRT) connectors, direct freeway connectors, and goods movement projects.

Transportation Project Evaluations and Rankings

Based on Board-adopted evaluation criteria, a draft list of ranked projects was distributed in March 2007. Staff has finalized the ranking of the improvements included in the Unconstrained Network of highway and transit projects. The rankings provide strong indications of the relative priority of the main corridors serving the San Diego region. They confirmed the region’s already established commitments to the three major north-south corridors: I-5, I-15, and I-805.

The final rankings reflect several minor criteria adjustments to the draft rankings. The criterion for congestion relief, a major factor in each project’s ranking, now incorporates both existing and future congestion relief. For the high vehicular crash rate criterion, staff worked with Caltrans to better identify non-freeway facilities with poor accident rates. And, projects were scored in four of the ten criteria on a graduated scale instead of assigning absolute values of 1 through 5. The final rankings for highway and transit projects are shown in Attachments 1 and 2.

Revenue Constrained Scenario

While the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario is the primary planning scenario for the region, the Revenue Constrained scenario is a fiscally conservative and federally required scenario that must be analyzed and included in any RTP. It only assumes traditional sources of revenues through the year 2030. The estimated revenues for the 2007 Revenue Constrained scenario are $40.6 billion in constant 2006 dollars. (This is compared to $35.7 billion in the adopted 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP.)

One key factor in creating the Revenue Constrained scenario is that only projects in this plan can be programmed into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The RTIP is a rolling, five-year document that incrementally implements the latest update to the RTP. Since the RTP is updated at least every four years, it is important that any projects completing an environmental document, or needing funding in that timeframe, be in the Revenue Constrained scenario. Projects
in the later years of the RTP are not as crucial for programming purposes since specific project level work has not begun.

In February 2006, the Board of Directors approved an updated 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP. Given revenue availability, updated cost estimates, and project commitments, the draft Revenue Constrained scenario for the 2007 RTP is fairly consistent with that plan. However, when the final project rankings were available, staff reevaluated the ranking of non-TransNet EAP projects in the initial Revenue Constrained scenario against high-ranking projects not included in the initial Revenue Constrained scenario. The only changes were to add two HOV lanes from the number one ranked project, I-5 between La Jolla Village Drive and I-8, and to remove two much lower-ranked projects: the widening of SR 56 between I-5 and I-15, and the HOV lanes on SR 125 between SR 54 and SR 94.

Attachment 3 lists the Major Capital Improvements suggested for the 2007 Revenue Constrained Plan and compares projects and costs with the previous 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP. (Attachments 4 and 5 are maps of the draft 2007 Revenue Constrained highway and transit networks.) Key components are summarized below.

- The highway network completes the I-15 Managed Lanes but only includes the first phase of investment in the I-5 and I-805 corridors.
- Several sections of I-805 would initially provide two HOV lanes versus the ultimate four Managed Lanes, and no HOV lanes would be constructed south of Palomar Street. This reduced scope reflects efforts by Caltrans and SANDAG to identify improvements that could be accomplished within the available resources identified in the Revenue Constrained RTP.
- For the I-5 corridor, four Managed Lanes could be added from La Jolla Village Drive north to Vandegrift Boulevard and two HOV lanes south from La Jolla Village Drive to I-8. However, many of the enhancements (e.g., Direct Access Ramps, auxiliary lanes, local interchange improvements, aesthetic treatments) would have to be deferred until additional resources could be identified.
- As for State Route (SR) 11, it is assumed that this project could be built as a toll road for $300 million through a public/private partnership, with a $50 million contribution from the region. This would allow the other $250 million allocated in the previous RTP for this project to go toward other regional projects.
- In addition, it should be noted that the SR 241 toll road proposed by Transportation Corridor Agencies in Orange County continues to be included in the draft Revenue Constrained scenario.
- The 2007 Revenue Constrained transit network is heavily influenced by the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP). TransNet EAP transit routes include the Super Loop, BRT services on I-15 and I-805, Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit project, Blue and Orange Line Trolley capital improvements, and extension of the Green Line to downtown.
- Two additional transit routes also are proposed to be added to the 2006 network: Route 470 BRT service from Escondido to Sorrento Mesa and Route 680 BRT service from Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa. While Route 470 has a lower ranking than other projects, the Transportation Committee felt it important to improve transit service to Sorrento Mesa since it is a key...
regional employment center. It is included in the Revenue Constrained scenario since it is part of the 2012 I-15 BRT Operations Plan that was approved by the Transportation Committee on February 16, 2007.

- As was the case with the 2006 update, investments are proposed for new rail corridors (Mid-Coast), along with improvements in existing rail corridors (Blue/Orange/Green Trolley lines, SPRINTER, and COASTER).
  - The improvements to the trolley system include rehabilitation and replacement, along with retrofitting stations to accommodate low-floor vehicles and two South Bay grade separations on the Blue Line that will enable increases in service frequency.
  - The SPRINTER project involves double tracking the full line between Oceanside and Escondido (consistent with the 2006 RTP), providing the second phase of improvements needed to realize the goal of operating 15-minute service frequencies throughout the day. In the TransNet Ordinance, funding for transit improvements in the SR 78 corridor was centered on either SPRINTER improvements or the implementation of parallel BRT service along the Palomar Airport Road corridor (Route 471). Both services were included in the evaluation rankings, with the SPRINTER double tracking ranking as a higher priority.
  - The COASTER improvements are phased (consistent with the 2006 RTP). The Revenue Constrained improvements center on double tracking (enabling higher service frequencies) and construction of the Del Mar tunnel (to address the long-standing goal of shifting the tracks away from the ocean bluffs). Completion of the University City tunnel remains in the Reasonably Expected scenarios discussed below. In the TransNet Ordinance, funding for transit improvements in the north I-5 corridor was to be provided for COASTER improvements or a parallel BRT service along El Camino Real (Route 472). Both projects were included in the evaluation rankings, with the COASTER improvements ranking as a higher priority.

Attachment 6 lists the proposed transit network of routes and proposed frequencies. The overall breakdown of major expenditures by project categories is shown in Attachment 7.

**Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios**

A higher level of investment in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario would offer the region better mobility than the Revenue Constrained scenario and was the basis for the preferred plan in the MOBILITY 2030 RTP. MOBILITY 2030, adopted in 2003, assumed the extension of TransNet, additional state and federal gas taxes, and additional state and federal discretionary revenues, as new sources of funding for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. Approved by the voters in November 2004, the TransNet Extension dollars were included in the adopted 2006 Revenue Constrained RTP and also are included as part of the 2007 Revenue Constrained scenario. But in the years since the last RTP, the local TransNet funding gain has been offset by rising project costs and lower-than-expected revenues from the state and federal sources.
As a result, the limited resources in the 2007 Revenue Constrained scenario would not provide for all of the planned improvements identified in the region’s priority corridors. In MOBILITY 2030, additional funding sources increased revenues from $30 billion to $42 billion. A similar increase in revenues for the 2007 RTP would be needed to approach the projected performance of MOBILITY 2030 and to make the region competitive should additional funding sources become available in the future.

As directed by the Board in March, the investment strategy for any Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario would be a balanced distribution between highway and transit improvements. Therefore, in preparing these scenarios, after removing the costs for the shared Managed Lanes facilities, additional dollars were distributed between the modes. The application strategy was to finish planned improvements in priority corridors, using the Board-approved project criteria. Which projects and how many should be added to the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario would depend on the level of investment and results of the performance evaluation process. Staff evaluated investment level increases of $4 billion and $10 billion above the Revenue Constrained scenario.

Specific investment options for the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario are discussed below and shown in more detail in Attachments 8 and 9. As expected, as the level of investment goes up, the performance measures improve for one or both modes in each option. Option 2A, with a balance between highway and transit investments, shows the best overall benefit to the region. When compared to the Revenue Constrained scenario, the average work trip travel speeds improve 6 percent for autos and 3½ percent for transit, and the amount of freeway traffic affected by congestion during the peak period drops from 41 percent to 31 percent. The benefits of Options 2B and 2C, with their individual focus on highway or transit improvements, reflect improvements in one area to the detriment of the other. Corridor performance measures and a complement of 24 regional performance measures will be generated for base conditions and each revenue scenario in the Draft RTP.

Option 1: +$4 Billion = $45B Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario (Balanced)

- In a balanced approach to the allocation of $4 billion of additional investment, the region could fully fund the I-5 North and I-805 corridors. These improvements would finish the four Managed Lanes along the entire I-805 corridor ($1.4 billion), and the enhancements for I-5 North ($0.5 billion). Rankings for projects in both of these corridors are very high.

- On the transit side, SANDAG, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD) staffs would propose service enhancements to the draft Revenue Constrained transit network and additional capital investments such as the Sorrento Mesa transit guideway, and frequency improvements to the existing transit network that would bring service levels up to those proposed by the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and the NCTD revised service plan. These services would be concentrated in the MTS urban core area and key corridors in North County such as connections with the SPRINTER and the Highway 101 corridor. Funding for new BRT and arterial rapid services would be limited to two new routes in the urban area.
Option 2A: +$10 Billion = $51B Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario (Balanced)

With an additional $10 billion investment and a balanced allocation between highways and transit, the following highway improvements ranked the highest and are shown in Attachment 11:

- After completing the I-5 North and I-805 corridors included in Option 1, an additional $1.1 billion would be needed to add HOV lanes on the next highest ranking corridor, I-5 from I-8 to SR 905.
- The next two priority corridors would get two HOV lanes: SR 94/125 from I-805 east to I-8 and SR 78 between I-5 and I-15, along with the HOV connectors at I-15. These improvements cost an additional $1.7 billion.
- Widening SR 67, the west end of SR 52, and I-8 east to Los Coches Road would round out the highway list.

A number of additional new transit services could be implemented over Option 1, and they would significantly enhance the role transit plays in the region, especially during peak-commute times:

- Frequency improvements to the existing transit network that would bring service levels up to those proposed by the MTS COA and the NCTD revised service plan. These services would be concentrated in the MTS urban core area and key corridors in North County such as connections with the SPRINTER and the Highway 101 corridor.
- In addition to the Sorrento Mesa Transit Guideway under Option 1, an additional transit guideway would be added in the Downtown-Kearny Mesa corridor. Together, these two projects would create dedicated transit facilities in two of the busiest corridors in the region that would maximize transit operating speeds and connectivity and would bypass congested freeway and arterials for a number of BRT, arterial rapid, and local bus services. In addition, this scenario also would fund the SPRINTER rail extension from the Escondido Transit Center to Westfield Shoppingtown North County.
- Several new arterial rapid services would be included along corridors in the urban core areas of the MTS and NCTD service areas, including: University Avenue, Adams Avenue, 30th Street, Euclid Avenue, Genesee Avenue, and El Camino Real; and peak-period, limited stop commuter express services in the south I-5 and SR 94 corridors.
- Other projects that would be funded include: a local match contribution in support of the San Diego region’s link to the California High-Speed Rail Authority project along the I-15 corridor, additional rehabilitation/replacement improvements to the trolley system, regional rail grade separations, and bus transit priority measures.

These new BRT and arterial rapid transit services were chosen based on the prioritized list of routes from the Unconstrained Transit Network, as shown in Attachment 12. Necessary freeway connectors and HOV/BRT connectors would be coordinated with transit improvements and grouped with adjacent freeway improvements. These various rail, BRT/arterial rapid, and local bus projects reflect the priorities from the Independent Transit Planning Review, MTS COA, and NCTD Fast Forward plan.
Option 2B: +$10 Billion = $51B Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario (Highway Emphasis)

If a full $10 billion investment were targeted to highway improvements, all of the improvements in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario from MOBILITY 2030 could be built. This includes the regional HOV system and selected widenings farther down in the project rankings. In addition, roughly $2 billion more would be available for many of the remaining HOV and freeway connectors, as well as expanding sections of the I-5 and I-805 corridors to ten general purpose lanes. The full list is included in Attachment 8 and displayed in Attachment 13.

Option 2C: +$10 Billion = $51B Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario (Transit Emphasis)

Were $10 billion in funding available for transit, the full Unconstrained Transit Network shown in Attachment 14 could be funded. This network would include a number of new BRT and arterial rapid bus services, frequency improvements to existing local services, and additional funding for regional rail grade separation projects and transit priority measures. Several transit-only lanes along I-5 and SR 94 would be constructed to support BRT services.

Possible Additions to any Reasonably Expected Revenue Investment Level

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – While not an added program from additional funding, staff recommends a small increase in the share for transportation demand management (TDM) programs off the top, similar to the percentage they receive in the Revenue Constrained Scenario. This small amount ($15 million to $36 million) would provide additional incentives to address the demand side of travel during the peak period versus the supply side.

Toll Facilities – Staff recommends that the I-5 Managed Lanes north of SR 76 and the I-15 Managed Lanes north of SR 78 be added to the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario as toll facilities. This approach addresses the growing congestion in these North County corridors without impacting our investment dollars elsewhere in the region.

Goods Movement Action Plan (GMAP) Projects – In September 2006, the Board of Directors accepted the prioritized list of projects from the regional GMAP for inclusion into the 2007 RTP. SANDAG staff and the Regional Freight Working Group (FWG) are working together to identify high-priority GMAP projects outside the normal highway and transit projects that could be included in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario. Estimated at up to $3 billion, it could be assumed that these projects would not compete with other RTP projects but would pursue unique funding sources. An example is improvements to border crossing facilities funded by potential container/truck fees charged at these binational gateways. The recommended list of projects would be included in the Draft RTP in June, while lower-priority GMAP projects would remain in the Unconstrained Revenue Scenario.

Local Share – A suggestion at the March 23 Board of Directors meeting was to include $2 billion for local improvements as an add-on to a higher level investment package. This assumption could be added to any of the above Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios.
Next Steps

Based on the recommendation of the Board of Directors, staff will use the draft Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios as the basis for preparing the Draft 2007 RTP.

In order to release the Draft 2007 RTP in June, a Draft Revenue Constrained Network needs to be defined by the April 27, 2007, Board meeting. This schedule will allow time to perform the necessary air quality conformity analysis for a June release of the Draft 2007 RTP. The Draft Environment Impact Report (EIR) would follow in July. Adoption of the 2007 RTP is scheduled for November. While specific networks are needed by April, potential funding sources for the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario are not needed until June. Staff proposes to continue working with the Transportation Committee and Board to identify the list of potential revenue sources to fund the level of investment desired in the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Final RTP Highway Project Rankings, Unconstrained Network Improvements, April 9, 2007
2. Final RTP Transit Project Rankings, Unconstrained Network Improvements, April 9, 2007

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix, (619) 699-1977, mhi@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000400
### Final RTP Highway Project Rankings

#### Unconstrained Network Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Phase in Revenue Constrained</th>
<th>TransNet, EAP &amp; Toll</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Freeway From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,410</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>H St</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F / 14F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Env)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Transit)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Transit)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP (Transit)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>6F/6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Drive</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Mission Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES (PE only)</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>SR 75/SR 282</td>
<td>Glorietta Blvd.</td>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Maplesview St</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-805 College Ave</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,080</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$457</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Pala Mission Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>La Jolla Indian Res</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The projects below are not ranked as they are under construction, environmentally cleared or toll facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Phase in Revenue Constrained</th>
<th>TransNet, EAP &amp; Toll</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Freeway From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$427</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$428</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy.</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>SR 241</td>
<td>Orange County Cristianitos Rd</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$386</td>
<td>SR 241</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Toll</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>8F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final - April 9, 2007**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Phase in Revenue Constrained</th>
<th>TransNet &amp; EAP</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES EAP (Capital)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Blue Line San Ysidro to Santa Fe Depot via Park/C Street</td>
<td>$452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Showcase SDSU - Downtown via El Cajon Blvd &amp; Downtown-Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Green Line Santee to 12th and Imperial via Bayside Alignment</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES EAP</td>
<td>4, 6, 16</td>
<td>610, 608, 607</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Escondido - Downtown Core via I-15 &amp; SR 94, Escondido Express and Rancho Bernardo Express via Downtown-Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Otay Border - UTC via SR 125, Palomar St., I-805, I-15, SR 52, I-805 &amp; UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES EAP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Otay Border to Downtown Express via SR 125, Palomar St., I-805, SR 94 &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>Coaster Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>$2,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES EAP (Capital)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Orange Line El Cajon to American Plaza via Park/C Street</td>
<td>$303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES EAP (Capital)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Orange Line El Cajon to American Plaza via Park/C Street</td>
<td>$303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Downtown SD to Sorrento Mesa via UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$1,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Sprinter Oceanside to Westfield North County (Double tracking, Top 4 Grade Separations)</td>
<td>$901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Escondido/Riverside - Sorrento Mesa/UTC via I-15 &amp; UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa - Downtown via Downtown-Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>San Ysidro - Downtown - Kearny Mesa via I-5, B St., Broadway, &amp; Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>La Mesa - Old Town via University</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Express Bus</td>
<td>East County - Downtown via SR 125, SR 94 &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>SDSU - Downtown - Spring Valley via Adams, 1st St., &amp; Logan</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Mira Mesa - Downtown via I-15 &amp; SR 94</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>North Park - Downtown via 30th St. &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>UTC - I-5 via La Jolla Village, La Jolla Blvd, &amp; Grand Ave.</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>SDSU - National City via 54th St., Euclid Ave., &amp; Main St.</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Fashion Valley - UTC/UCSD via SR 163, Genesee Ave., &amp; La Jolla Village</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside - UTC via I-5 &amp; UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa/UTC - Downtown via UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway, I-5, &amp; Broadway</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>National City - Allied Gardens via Euclid &amp; Fairmount</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Inland South Bay to UTC via Palomar St., I-805, Nobel Dr., Voight &amp; Gilman</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>San Ysidro - 8th St. Trolley via San Ysidro Blvd, 3rd Ave., &amp; Highland</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Inland South Bay to Sorrento Mesa via Palomar St., I-805, Nobel Dr. &amp; UTC/Sorrento Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Escondido - Kearny Mesa via I-15, Balboa Ave., &amp; Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Pacific Beach - Kearny Mesa via Garnet &amp; Balboa Ave.</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>East County - Kearny Mesa via Cuyamaca, SR 52 &amp; Downtown-Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Mira Mesa - UTC/UCSD via Black Mountain Rd., Miramar Rd, &amp; La Jolla Village &amp; Gilman Dr.</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>H St Trolley - Otay Ranch via H St., Palomar St. &amp; SR 125</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Bay Park - Kearny Mesa via Clairemont Dr., Clairemont Mesa &amp; Balboa Ave.</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside - San Marcos via Palomar Airport Rd</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Old Town - Ocean Beach via Midway Dr., W. Point Loma Blvd, &amp; Cable St.</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>El Cajon to Otay Border Crossing via 125</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Spring Valley - National City via Jamacha, Paradise Valley Rd., &amp; Plaza</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>70th St Trolley - Spring Valley via Alvarado Rd., College Ave., &amp; Skyline Dr.</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside - Palomar Airport via College Ave and Melrose</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside - Vista via Mission, SR 76, &amp; N. Santa Fe</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES TransNet</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Otay Border - Imperial Beach via SR 125, SR 905 &amp; Palm Ave.</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS – 2006 vs. 2007 REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIO ($ MILLIONS)

Differences between the 2006 and 2007 Revenue Constrained Scenario are in strikeout and shaded. Boxed items indicate the changes since the March 2007 Draft Revenue Constrained Scenario.

**Transit Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTERT Rail</td>
<td>$484</td>
<td>$385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast Light Rail</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
<td>$940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Parking Structures</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTERT Rail Double Tracking and North County Fair Extension</td>
<td>$199</td>
<td>$580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Double Tracking and Other Improvements*</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Tunnel (Del Mar only)*</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved/New Major Transit Stations and Centers</td>
<td>$519</td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Access Ramps to Managed/HOV Lanes</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit First Priority Measures/Enhancements Funding</td>
<td>$481</td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles for New Services</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial BRT Transit Priority Improvements</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $5,952 $6,234

**HOV and Managed Lane Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
<td>8F/10F</td>
<td>8F/10F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>8F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F + 2ML (R)</td>
<td>10F + 4ML/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>10F + 4ML/M/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy.</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV/2ML (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 54/SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F + 2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905 Palomar St.</td>
<td>SR 54/SR 94</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8 SR 52</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Carroll Cyn Rd.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8 Carroll Cyn Rd.</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F + 4ML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $6,400 $4,408

**HOV and BRT Connectors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>South to West &amp; East to North</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>North to North &amp; South to South</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>North to West &amp; East to South</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $661 $407
## Highway System Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5/I-805</td>
<td>Port of Entry - Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Inspection Facility</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11**</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4E 4T</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125***</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,285 $1,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Highway Widening, Arterials, and Freeway Interchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>J Street</td>
<td>Sea World Dr.</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>Access Improvements</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>10F</td>
<td>14F</td>
<td>$186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 75/SR 282****</td>
<td>Glorietta Blvd.</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd.</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C + 2TU (Preliminary Engineering only)</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Dr.</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125***</td>
<td>Telegraph Cyn.</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>8T</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>San Miguel Rd.</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 241***</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4T/6T</td>
<td>$536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Arterials and Local Access Freeway Interchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,451 $1,835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Freeway Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersecting Freeway</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>West to South &amp; South to East</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>West to North &amp; South to East</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $18,284 $15,281

**KEY:**
- C = Conventional
- T = Toll Lanes
- F = Freeway Lanes
- ML = Managed Lanes (HOV & Value Pricing)
- ML(R) = Managed Lanes (Reversible)
- MB = Movable Barrier
- TU = Tunnel
- * = funding from state/federal discretionary transportation funding sources
- ** = public/private partnership
- *** = privately funded
- **** = funding from federal discretionary defense funding sources
### PHASED TRANSIT SERVICES – 2007 REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR ¹</th>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PEAK HEADWAY (MINUTES)</th>
<th>OFF-PEAK HEADWAY (MINUTES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC Super Loop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Escondido Rapid Bus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Increase in Blue Line Service (current headways 7½/15)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>Escondido to Centre City via I-15/SR 94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Escondido to Sorrento Mesa via Mira Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard to Centre City</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa via I-805/SR 52/I-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>Otay Mesa to Centre City via SR 94/I-805</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Increase in COASTER Service (current headways 36/120)*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Increase in SPRINTER Rail (opening headways 30/30)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Mid-Coast LRT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Increase in Blue Line Trolley Service</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Increase in Orange Line Trolley Service (current headways 15/15)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Increase in Green Line Trolley Service (current headways 15/15)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>Increase in Escondido to Centre City via I-15/SR 94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Increase in Escondido to Sorrento Mesa via Mira Mesa Blvd.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>Increase in Otay Mesa to Centre City via SR 94/I-805</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Increase in Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa via I-805/SR 52/I-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Increase in SPRINTER Rail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These projects are included in the 2008, 2009, 2010, 2014, 2020, and 2030 analysis years for air quality assessment.

* Average headways
### MAJOR EXPENDITURES
#### 2007 REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIO
\((\text{\$ MILLIONS})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Development &amp; Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major New Facilities</td>
<td>$852</td>
<td>$3,219</td>
<td>$1,881</td>
<td>$5,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Capital/Rehabilitation/Replacement</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$738</td>
<td>$803</td>
<td>$1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Subsidies</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$2,415</td>
<td>$5,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$2,016</td>
<td>$6,059</td>
<td>$5,099</td>
<td>$13,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed/High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Facilities</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$3,390</td>
<td>$2,121</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Completion/Widening Projects</td>
<td>$2,424</td>
<td>$1,338</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$4,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$114</td>
<td>$259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$622</td>
<td>$711</td>
<td>$1,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$766</td>
<td>$2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$4,586</td>
<td>$6,415</td>
<td>$4,307</td>
<td>$15,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Streets and Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facility Construction</td>
<td>$1,072</td>
<td>$1,811</td>
<td>$1,990</td>
<td>$4,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Significant Arterials</td>
<td>$214</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>$5,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$2,336</td>
<td>$4,128</td>
<td>$4,453</td>
<td>$10,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use/Systems Management/Demand Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>$377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems Management</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$442</td>
<td>$623</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$9,117</td>
<td>$17,044</td>
<td>$14,482</td>
<td>$40,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 1: $45 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Highway Network

#### Improvements over the Draft 2007 Revenue Constrained Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 13, 20</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd.</td>
<td>8F/14F+4ML</td>
<td>Adds DARs and other amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 11, 14, 16, 18</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F+2HOV/4ML</td>
<td>Completes 4ML along entire corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2A: $51 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Highway Network

#### Improvements over Option #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 10</td>
<td>$934</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 28, 32</td>
<td>$834</td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>I-15/SR 78</td>
<td>HOV Connector</td>
<td>East to South &amp; North to West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St.</td>
<td>Dye Rd.</td>
<td>2C/4C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2B: $51 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Highway Emphasis

#### Improvements over Option #2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 13, 20</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd.</td>
<td>8F/14F+4ML</td>
<td>Adds 10F to Vandegrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 11, 14, 16, 18</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>Adds 2GP lanes from H St. to I-8 and SR 52 to La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>Adds 2 GP lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr.</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>Adds 2 GP lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 28, 32</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 39</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>SR 54/SR 125</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 49</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Jamacha Rd.</td>
<td>4F/4C</td>
<td>6F/6C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Rd.</td>
<td>Steele Cyn Rd.</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$211</td>
<td>I-54-8</td>
<td>Freeway Connector</td>
<td>East to North &amp; South to West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>I-15/SR 56</td>
<td>Freeway Connector</td>
<td>North to West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>SR 75/SR 282</td>
<td>Glorietta Blvd.</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd.</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>6C+TU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Optional Highway Projects (Toll)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Vandegrift Blvd.</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 1: $45 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Transit Component

#### Improvements over the Draft 2007 Revenue Constrained Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost ($ millions)</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2030 Headways</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>Offpeak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,033</td>
<td>Draft Revenue Constrained Network Enhancements</td>
<td>Additional Capital Funds and Operations Subsidy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Increased service, Sorrento Mesa transit guideway, additional vehicles and station improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>Various bus routes</td>
<td>Transit Priority Meaures and Enhancements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Benefits existing transit system through faster speeds/lower operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$237</td>
<td>LRT &amp; Coaster</td>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Specific projects TBD based on grade separation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$552</td>
<td>Various bus routes</td>
<td>Increased service on existing routes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Brings additional routes in MTS urban core and key NCTD corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>San Ysidro - Downtown - Kearny Mesa via I-5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>La Mesa - Old Town via University Ave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2A: $51 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Transit Component

#### Improvements over Option #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2030 Headways</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>Offpeak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$812</td>
<td>Draft Revenue Constrained Network Enhancements</td>
<td>Additional Capital Funds</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>UTC Tunnel for Coaster, Sprinter Extension to Westfield Shoppingtown North County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>Existing transit service</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/ Replacement/Misc Capital</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>Various bus routes</td>
<td>Transit Priority Measures and Enhancements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Benefits existing transit system through faster speeds/lower operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>LRT &amp; Coaster</td>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Specific projects TBD based on grade separation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>Local Match for I-15 High Speed Rail System</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$879</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Downtown-Kearny Mesa via 4th/5th/SR163</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>East County - Downtown via SR 94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>SDSU - Downtown - Spring Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Mira Mesa - Downtown via I-15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>North Park - Downtown via 30th St</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>UTC - Downtown via La Jolla &amp; I-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>SDSU - National City via 54th St</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Fashion Valley - UTC/ UCSD via Genesee Ave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Oceanside - UTC via El Camino Real/I-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cost includes capital and operating costs
## Option 2C: $51 Billion Reasonably Expected Scenario - Transit Emphasis

### Improvements over Option #2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>RE Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2030 Headways</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>Offpeak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Existing transit service</td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Replacement/Misc Capital</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Various bus routes</td>
<td>Increased service on existing routes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Various bus routes</td>
<td>Transit Priority Measures and Enhancements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Benefits existing transit system through faster speeds/operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>LRT &amp; Coaster</td>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Specific projects TBD based on grade separation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,170</td>
<td>I-5 and SR 94 Corridors</td>
<td>Additional Transit-only lanes on freeways</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>For BRT Routes 90/640 assumed in Option #2 costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa/UTC - Downtown via I-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>National City - Allied Gardens via Fairmount</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Inland South Bay - UTC/UCSD via I-805</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>San Ysidro - 8th Street Trolley via Highland/4th</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Inland South Bay - Sorrento Mesa via I-805</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Escondido - Kearny Mesa via I-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Pacific Beach - Kearny Mesa via Balboa Ave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>East County to Kearny Mesa via SR 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Mira Mesa - UTC/UCSD via Miramar Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>H Street Trolley - Otay Ranch via H St</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Bay Park - Kearny Mesa via Clairemont Dr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Oceanside - San Marcos via Palomar Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Old Town - Ocean Beach via Midway Dr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>El Cajon - Otay Border via SR 125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Spring Valley - National City via Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>70th St Trolley - Spring Valley via College Ave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Oceanside - Palomar via College Blvd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Arterial Rapid</td>
<td>Oceanside - Vista via Mission Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Otay Border - Imperial Beach via SR 905</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Cost includes capital and operating costs
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OVERVIEW OF URBAN PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT
AND BUS PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Introduction

As part of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) strategy to reduce congestion, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Joint Program Office (JPO) has released a request for proposals from regions interested in entering into an Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA). UPA proposals are due by April 30, 2007. In conjunction, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has released a request for proposals, to be submitted by interested regions by May 22, 2007, as part of its Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Program.

Staff has been working with member agencies, the two transit agencies, Caltrans, private firms, and the academic community to develop UPA proposals that address the region’s needs and identify program elements that require funding. A letter from the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce indicating support of the SANDAG proposal is attached (Attachment 1). At the same time, staff is concurrently working on the Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities proposal with our partner transit operators at the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD). This proposal will be presented at the May 4, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting.

Discussion

The FHWA and FTA solicitations provide the region with a unique opportunity to expand existing activities that help implement our Regional Transportation and Comprehensive Plans and evaluate innovative approaches for solving congestion problems while also continuing to move forward with enhancements to our transit operations. The UPA and Bus/Bus Facilities Program provide a means to accelerate regional transportation investments, building upon current efforts.

Urban Partnership Agreement

The UPA solicitation requests that regions submit their immediate and comprehensive plan for reducing congestion. The USDOT is looking for innovative and aggressive initiatives that regions can implement and measure by the end of FY 2009. Each submitter’s “Congestion Reduction Plan” is expected to be focused on Tolling, Transit, Technology, and Telecommuting (Four Ts) components.

The award of a UPA is a designation that does not carry any direct funding; however, designees will receive preferential consideration for the UPA supporting funding programs. These funding
programs, as identified below, consist of existing discretionary programs managed by FHWA and FTA, from which approximately $1.2 billion is being made available. Staff has identified six of the funding programs as targets for our submission based on the applicability to our region and our ability to be competitive. While we could pursue all twelve programs, we are not likely to be competitive based on the requirements of those funding opportunities.

SANDAG UPA Targets

- Intelligent Transportation Systems-Operational Testing to Mitigate Congestion (ITS-OTMC)
- Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP)
- New Starts/Small Starts Program
- Bus and Bus Facilities Program
- Alternatives Analysis Program
- Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Program

Other Opportunities

- Highways for Life
- Truck Parking Pilot Program
- Delta Region Development Program
- Ferry Boat Discretionary Program
- Innovative Bridge Research and Deployment Program
- Public Lands Highway Discretionary Program

Staff has developed the UPA and supporting discretionary grant proposals to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan guiding principles of systems management and demand management. The proposals incorporate innovative concepts and technologies for transportation management that are being developed as part of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan. The project elements listed below and further identified in the attached briefing document (Attachment 2, SANDAG Urban Partnership Agreement Proposal) have been developed with a focus on the San Diego region’s needs and achieving effects.

VALUE PRICING ON MANAGED LANES, CONNECTORS, AND RAMPS
Drivers will be offered the choice to purchase a range of premium, value-priced service options such as express lane use and ramp meter bypass capabilities.

SWOOP
Will enable a small fleet of transit vehicles to service a new BRT route that makes use of the hard shoulder along the I-805 corridor. A small number of selected freight operators will be offered the opportunity to run similarly equipped goods vehicles on the same shoulders, on a fee-paying basis.

SMART PARKING
A sophisticated parking information and management system to determine parking space availability at COASTER stations and offer parking reservations for a fee.
FLEXIBLE TRANSIT AND ALTERNATIVE SERVICES
A range of transit service enhancements. Includes bus priority, rented/leased personal electric vehicles, and focused carpool services addressing the “first mile/last mile” needs of transit services.

SMART VEHICLES
Approximately 600 vehicles equipped with wireless devices that will enable them to communicate with the roadside and to a management back office. Enables “push” information to travelers on real time transportation conditions, transit alternatives, and value-added services.

REGIONAL WIRELESS DATA NETWORK
Planning, design, deployment, and operation of a regionwide high-speed wireless data service capable of supporting the full range of technology projects defined for the region.

ENHANCED 511 SERVICES
Customized trip planning services and en-route information on competitive mode choice options delivered via smart vehicles, mobile and personal devices.

UNIVERSAL TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNT
Simpler more flexible choices for the payment of transportation-related user fees such as tolls, parking fees and transit tickets, building on current FasTrak and Compass card initiatives.

TRANSPORTATION INCENTIVES
Comprehensive incentive program that rewards the “smart traveler” and their employers. Offers loyalty program rewards in return for positive travel behavior changes such as mode shift or peak avoidance.

TRANSPORTATION NETWORK OPTIMIZATION
Management of the regional transportation network in a coordinated manner, supporting the management and direction of the overall program towards delivering results and value for dollars invested.

FTA Section 5309 Funds for Bus and Bus Facilities
There are three programs funded under Section 5309 of the Federal Transit Act. They include the Fixed Guideway Modernization program (Rail Mod), Fixed Guideway New Starts, and Bus and Bus Facilities discretionary program. The Rail Mod funds come to rail agencies based on a multi-tiered formula, and the SANDAG Board approved the Capital Improvement Program on March 23, 2007, to include the apportioning of these funds between the MTS and NCTD. The New Starts program funds major fixed guideway capital projects that already have or work towards Full Funding Grant Agreements like our region’s own Mission Valley East light rail and SPRINTER projects. Therefore, our current focus is on the Section 5309 Bus and Bus-Related Facilities Program.

For the past several years, Congress had fully earmarked the Bus and Bus Facilities through the annual appropriations process. However, for FY 2007, the Congressional leadership limited earmarks to only those projects authorized in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The SAFETEA-LU earmarks amounted to just over 51 percent
($459.7 million of $897.9 million) of the available funding, leaving a balance of $438.2 million available for FTA priorities.

On March 23, 2007, FTA published two notices regarding the Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Program. These notices provide two opportunities for accessing these Section 5309 funds. The notice entitled “Solicitation of Applications for Certain Funding Available in Fiscal Year 2007 Under the Federal Transit Administration’s Section 5309 Bus and Bus-Related Facilities Discretionary Grant Program to Support Urban Partnerships” indicates that a “significant portion” of the $438.2 million has been reserved for projects that support the Urban Partnership Program. The “significant portion” is not defined.

The other March 23, 2007, notice is entitled, “Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program Grants (Section 5309).” This notice provides for the submittal of grant applications to fund capital projects of a more traditional nature. However, this notice indicates that preference will be given to projects that address the following priority areas:

- Fleet replacement needs that cannot be met with formula funds
- Fleet expansion that allows significant service increase and/or improvements on clean fuels
- Strategic investments in rural areas where formula funding is inadequate
- Purchase of clean fuel vehicles
- Intermodal terminal projects that include intercity bus providers

The USDOT has indicated that projects supporting the Urban Partnership Program will be given preferential treatment. SANDAG staff is currently working with MTS and NCTD staff and management to identify projects and to develop an application strategy that we believe will increase the region’s competitiveness for these funds.

Proposal Timeline and Next Steps

The UPA proposal and supporting discretionary grants from FHWA are required to be submitted by April 30, 2007, with an anticipated award in August of this year. The Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities proposal must be submitted by May 22, 2007, and awards are anticipated to occur in September of this year. Staff will return to the Transportation Committee on May 4 with the proposed concepts for the Bus and Bus Facilities Program.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce letter dated 4/12/07
2. SANDAG Urban Partnership Agreement Proposal Briefing

Key Staff Contact: Samuel Johnson, (619) 699-6958, sj@sandag.org
April 12, 2007

Gary Gallegos
Executive Director
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Gallegos:

The San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce is proud to support SANDAG’s proposal to the U.S. Department of Transportation for an Urban Partnership Agreement.

SANDAG has worked in partnership with various government agencies, business and community organizations and the public at large to develop the UPA proposal, which will lead to an innovative, world-class transportation system for our region.

A vibrant effective transportation system is crucial to our economic prosperity and development. We are a growing bi-national region in urgent need of congestion relief and improved goods movement initiatives. Those elements are effectively addressed in this proposal.

The San Diego business community enjoys a strong collaborative relationship with SANDAG. We are very committed to actively supporting the comprehensive congestion reduction strategies outlined in the UPA proposal. The Chamber will take a leading role in this effort to ensure success and to demonstrate to other parts of the country that which is possible with regional cooperation, focus and vision.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Alevy
Vice President of Public Policy & Communications

SA:cs
INTRODUCTION
The development of the Urban Partnerships Agreement proposal from SANDAG to USDOT is currently underway. We have active dialogues open with potential public and private sector partners and have reached the point where a preliminary list of projects has been defined. SANDAG staff supported by California PATH and PBS&J are leading the proposal development.

This document provides a brief explanation of the UPA program, the expected content of the proposal, SANDAG’s approach, the current status of the proposal development effort and the support needed from state and regional leadership as we move towards submission of the proposal.

URBAN PARTNERSHIPS AGREEMENT PROGRAM
As part of the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Strategy to Reduce Congestion on America’s Transportation Network, the Urban Partnership Agreement solicited proposals from metropolitan areas to enter into agreements with the Department of Transportation in order to demonstrate strategies with a combined track record of effectiveness in reducing traffic congestion. To the maximum extent possible, the Department will support its Urban Partners with regulatory flexibility and dedicated expertise and personnel.

To support congestion-reducing strategies adopted by the Department’s urban partners (“Urban Partners”), the Department expects to utilize discretionary funding available under the Department’s Intelligent Transportation System Operational Testing to Mitigate Congestion Program (the “ITS-OTMC Program”), its Value Pricing Pilot Program (the “VPP Program”), and other discretionary grant, lending and credit support programs administered by the Department. Approximately $1.1 billion is currently available to be disbursed under this program, and it is expected that this will be supplemented with additional authorizations.

EXPECTED PROPOSAL CONTENT
USDOT has defined a set of requirements for the proposal. These can be summarized under the following headings:

Background: Discuss why traffic congestion in the region is severe, a summary of the problem, the readiness of the region’s political leadership to solve the problem and solutions to congestion that incorporate tolls, transit, technology and telecommuting.

Participating Parties: Provide a preliminary, non-binding list of public and private partners

Comprehensive Congestion Reduction Strategy: Explain a regional plan for reducing congestion through a coordinated set of projects and policies

Congestion Pricing Measures and Affected Areas: Identify the congestion pricing strategy and include the role that pricing would play in affecting congestion as well as specific vehicle categories and coverage area.

Transit Services: Describe transit services, including transit fare pricing policies, BRT and other commuter transit services that are to be provided or supplemented, and the expected impacts of the expanded transit services on congestion.

Telecommuting: Indicate telecommuting, flextime, and various related employer-employee policies to be adopted.

Expedited Project Completion: Discuss any major transportation projects that may be expedited by the UPA.

Travelers Affected Daily: Estimate the number of daily travelers affected including vehicles charged, travel time reductions, traveler mode shift, and telecommuting.

Use of Technology: Indicate what innovative technologies will be applied to achieve the region’s congestion reduction goals.

Research, Planning, and Experience: Present the prior work that the proposer and partners have done to reduce congestion, including research, planning, and actual implementation of congestion related activities.
Other Time-Frame Considerations: Indicate the dates during which applicants expect to conduct congestion reduction activities.

Funding Support: Estimate the cost to implement the overall congestion reduction strategy, anticipated source of funds and the amount requested to be covered by Federal sources.

SANDAG'S APPROACH

Our approach is to develop an effective proposal by focusing on the transportation needs of the San Diego region and aligning them with the direction of the USDOT. We have held initial discussions with senior USDOT staff to determine grant application requirement needs and to understand the background and context of the initiative.

Our strategy is based on the reduction of congestion on a region wide basis by tackling the dual aspects of demand management and capacity management in a coordinated manner. An effects-driven approach will be adopted with a strong focus on the definition of the relationship between dollars invested and effects achieved.

Demand management will be accomplished through the implementation of a range of projects designed to empower us with tools for demand management through traveler information services and behavior changing approaches, utilizing market and variable pricing and through mandatory traffic control and regulation.

Capacity management will be achieved through a complementary array of projects designed to maximize the operational management effectiveness of regional transportation across modes. This will reinforce the capacity gains being achieved through our current TransNet-driven infrastructure investment program.

Travelers will be empowered to make smarter travel decisions and have an extended range of user choices, including mode and service.

CURRENT STATUS

The program definition effort has included discussion with a number of potential public and private sector partners. This has resulted in the definition of a preliminary program of 10 major project elements as follows:

Value Pricing on Managed Lanes, Connectors, and Ramps

Building on the initial success delivered through the I-15 Managed Lanes and Dynamic Toll projects, this project will extend and enhance the portfolio of dynamic pricing mechanisms that SANDAG currently employs for demand management. Pricing infrastructure will be extended to cover selected connectors and a network of ramp meters in the region. Using a range of pricing strategies and mechanisms, SANDAG will offer regional commuters a wider range of new choices to purchase journey time savings and increased reliability.

Drivers will be offered the choice to purchase a range of premium, value-priced service options such as express lane use and ramp meter by-pass capabilities. This will provide drivers with a wider range of choices including − pay for a higher level of service, qualify through HOV, or choose to use the basic level of service currently provided. Recognizing that commuters’ needs may vary from day to day, this enables trade-offs between time and money savings.

The project will also provide a link between ramp meters and managed lane equipment allowing all elements to be managed in a coordinated fashion, towards the achievement of a coherent set of transportation performance measures. The project will also introduce open road tolling technologies similar to the current FasTrak system to connectors and ramps, enabling drivers to pay fees without stopping.

Swoop

Using advanced lane-keeping technology fitted to transit vehicles, this project will enable a small fleet of transit vehicles to service a new BRT route that makes use of the hard shoulder to secure reliable journey times for transit along the I-805 corridor. The emphasis will be placed on overall journey time reliability and spatial efficiency in road use rather than vehicle speed in order to manage differential speeds between lanes. Technology will be harnessed to assist transit operators in driving under space-constrained conditions.

This will enable SANDAG to offer transit as a competitive, reliable, congestion-avoiding alternative to the private car.

In the later stages of the project, a small number of selected freight operators will be offered the opportunity to run similarly equipped goods vehicles on the same shoulders as the transit vehicles, on a fee-paying basis. This will enable the goods operators to improve delivery reliability and provide SANDAG with the ability to evaluate a new business model for making the best use of available road space.
**Smart Parking**

A sophisticated parking information and management system making use of web technologies, wireless telecommunications and a parking sensor network will be deployed to deliver new services to the citizens of San Diego. As the first step towards a regional parking management system, drivers who park at selected stations along the Coaster route paralleling the I-5 will be able to determine parking space availability in real time and, if desired, reserve a predetermined parking space for an additional service fee.

In coordination with the managed lanes and public transit ticketing initiatives, this project will enable SANDAG to experiment with coordinated pricing for travel and explore ways to balance transportation demand by increasing value to transit users.

**Flexible Transit & Alternative Services**

A range of transit service enhancements will be deployed to provide a more comprehensive, attractive and flexible service offering. This will include a field and operational test involving the provision of rented/leased personal electric vehicles at each end of selected transit routes. This will provide SANDAG with the opportunity to gauge whether additional transit ridership could be achieved by addressing the distance gap that exists between where the transit service ends and where the user needs to go.

In a second element of this project, a ‘club coach’ type approach to ride sharing will be tested and evaluated. This involves the use of full sized transit buses on a subscription basis by defined group of users. This element will address coordination, administration, business model and data needs associated with the delivery of such a service.

Finally, the current carpool program will be enhanced to provide focused carpool services to and from transit facilities, addressing the “first mile/last mile” needs of transit services.

**Smart Vehicles**

Approximately 600 vehicles in the current SANDAG vanpool fleet will be equipped with in-vehicle equipment that will enable them to communicate with the roadside and to a management back office. This will enable SANDAG to “push” information to travelers regarding real time transportation conditions, transit alternatives and possibly value-added services including dynamic route guidance and parking information.

The equipped vehicles will also act as “probe data” sources enabling a wide range of data to be collected and converted to information for demand and capacity management. Data to be collected includes travel times, vehicle status and operating information. This will be supplemented by the development of applications that use probe data to develop transportation management strategies and information based services for customers.

This will provide the opportunity to evaluate vehicle related components as possible future enhancements to the current electronic toll collection system to support automated fee payment for parking and managed lanes/ramps usage.

Another important dimension to the project lies in the ability to explore and evaluate the possible use of technology to support distance-based user fees as a possible alternative to fuel-based taxation. The project will address the back office needs of the system.

**Regional Wireless Data Network**

The project will involve the planning, design, deployment and operation of a region-wide high speed wireless data service capable of supporting the full range of technology projects defined for the region. Primarily designed to support transportation applications such as smart vehicles, enhanced arterial data collection, public access to WiFi on transit vehicles and a wide range of other advanced transportation technology projects, this will also offer a platform for cities in the San Diego region to enhance public safety operations. It will also include the evaluation and consideration of regional or state-wide business models for maintenance and operations, adopting a managed service approach to wireless service delivery.

**Enhanced 511 Services**

Enhancements will be made to the current 511 traveler information system to provide customized trip planning services and information on competitive mode choice options delivered via smart vehicles, mobile and personal devices.

This includes the provision of concierge style services to travelers enabling them to make the best mode, route and timing choices for their trips. The possibility for commercialization of traveler information and related services to provide revenue for transportation will also be explored.

**Universal Transportation Account**

This will deliver increased value and convenience of payment for transportation services by providing users...
with simpler and more flexible choices for the payment of transportation-related user fees such as tolls, parking fees and transit tickets. This pilot project would build on current FasTrak and Compass card initiatives by integrating the computer systems for tolling, transit and parking payments providing users with a single account to manage all their transportation expenses. The project will also test the use of new public-private partnerships and managed service approaches to system delivery, operation and management.

**Transportation Incentives**

In order to further promote telecommuting, this project includes “flex schedule” programs as a method to provide peak spreading in addition to removing vehicles from the system on certain days. A regional/state program that would provide financial rewards to employers for actual telecommuting by employees will be piloted.

Leveraging the Universal Transportation Account pilot and new enforcement strategies for FasTrak, this project provides a means to introduce a comprehensive incentive program that rewards the “smart traveler”.

This project will also test the technological and business model needs of a “congestion avoidance rewards” approach to demand management. Peak hour drivers will be invited to participate in a pilot project that offers loyalty program rewards in return for positive travel behavior changes such as mode shift or peak avoidance.

**Transportation Network Optimization**

This project will facilitate the management of the regional transportation network in a coordinated manner taking full account of transportation policy objectives and the desired effects. This involves the development of a data collection and data communications plan to supply data to a special purpose back office focused on management decision support for network wide operations and performance management.

The back office will support the conversion of data to information and the creation of transportation network management strategies. In addition to the technical development of the back office system, the project will address organizational and commercial aspects associated with the establishment and operation of the system.

A focus of the activity will be the provision of information that supports the management and direction of the overall program towards effects attainment and value for dollars invested.

**PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS**

Partnerships are a significant feature of this effort. The following partners are currently engaged in the delivery of these services:

- SANDAG and Member Agencies
- IBM
- USDOT
- University of Iowa
- MTS / NCTD
- Origin Technologies
- Caltrans / PATH / CCIT
- ParkingCarma
- Motorola
- SWOOP

**PROPOSAL SCHEDULE**

The proposal is due for delivery to USDOT on April 30, 2007. USDOT has indicated that a negotiation period will then take place leading to a selection in August 2007 and project initiation in October 2007.

**WHAT WE NEED FROM LEADERSHIP**

USDOT has indicated that strong local political support is required to be demonstrated if the proposal is to be successful. Leadership action and direction setting is requested with regard to achieving the political support required and demonstrating this to USDOT. Over the next two weeks we would like to receive the following support from senior management and leadership in the region:

1. Letters of support
2. Quotations that can be used to demonstrate strong top down support at state and regional levels

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

**CONTACT**

Samuel Johnson, Chief Technology Officer, SANDAG
Phone: (619) 699-6958 / E-mail: sjo@sandag.org
FY 2007 BUDGET AMENDMENT: GOODS MOVEMENT
POLICY MANAGER

Introduction

The FY 2007 Budget includes a new Senior Transportation Planner position to coordinate SANDAG goods movement planning activities. Following the approval of this position in the budget, SANDAG conducted a recruitment process for this position, but it was unsuccessful. As a result, the SANDAG Executive Director has discussed with the Executive Director of the San Diego Unified Port District (Port District) the concept of hiring a “goods movement policy manager” at a higher classification, who would provide policy level support to both SANDAG and the Port District on goods movement project and program initiatives. SANDAG and the Port District would share the costs of funding this position.

On April 13, 2007, the Executive Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve this proposal.

Discussion

As discussed above, under this proposal SANDAG and the Port District would enter into an agreement to hire a Goods Movement Policy Manager with substantial expertise in the area of goods movement planning, project development, and operations, who would represent both agencies in a variety of interagency initiatives aimed at improving the San Diego region’s capacity to efficiently handle increased goods movement activities over the coming years. Some of the major activities in which this individual would participate include the Southern California Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan, the West Coast Corridor Coalition, and development of proposals for Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund and Emission Reduction funding allocations.

Under the proposed agreement, the Port District would pay SANDAG $50,000 per year to help cover the costs of the position, which is expected to continue for a term of three years. The individual in this position would report to the SANDAG Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning; however, SANDAG would confer with the Port District staff regarding the selection of the employee, and the selection of specific work assignments for this employee. Additional details regarding the position are described in the draft agreement (Attachment 1).
The position would have no financial impact to SANDAG during FY 2007 since the Senior Transportation Planner position was budgeted and has not been filled. The position also would be recommended for inclusion in the FY 2008 Budget. There would be no impact to the FY 2008 budget given the carryover of salary savings and the offsetting revenues from Port District of $50,000.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Understanding between San Diego Unified Port District and San Diego Association of Governments Regarding Sharing of Goods Movement Policy Manager

Key Staff Contact: Bob Leiter, (619) 699-6980, ble@sandag.org
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT
AND SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGARDING SHARING OF GOODS MOVEMENT POLICY MANAGER

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU):

WHEREAS, both the San Diego Unified Port District (Port District) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) engage in goods movement planning for the San Diego region; and

WHEREAS, the Port District and SANDAG have identified the need to retain an individual at a management level that would coordinate goods movement planning and project development activities for the region; and

WHEREAS, neither the Port District nor SANDAG have the need or ability to fund a full-time person as a goods movement policy manager (Position); and

WHEREAS, the Port District is willing to fund a portion of the compensation for an individual (Employee) to fill the Position on the conditions that a mutually acceptable Employee is selected, the Port District is provided with an opportunity to provide input into the selection of projects to which Employee is assigned, and Employee performs satisfactorily; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG is willing to hire Employee as an at-will contract employee to fill the Position, fund the balance of Employee’s compensation, and allow the Port District to provide input into the selection of the Employee and the work assignments of the Employee; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the citizens of the San Diego region for the parties to this MOU to implement a plan that will allow for coordination of the parties’ goods movement planning;

NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereto enter into this MOU effective as of this ______ day of April, 2007 and resolve:

1. SANDAG shall hire Employee as an at-will contract employee to fill the Position for a period of up to three years.

2. Port District shall pay SANDAG at the rate of $50,000 per year for the period beginning at the Employee’s start date and ending on June 30, 2008. SANDAG and the Port District shall review the Port District’s payment rate prior to June 30, 2008, and may reach agreement on a higher payment rate for the remaining portion of the Employee’s contract. The maximum amount payable by Port under this MOU is estimated at $150,000, plus any additional amount mutually agreeable to SANDAG and the Port District.

3. SANDAG shall bill Port District annually on or about May 1 of each year for Port District’s portion of the Position funding. Port District shall pay SANDAG within 30 days of being invoiced. In the event Employee’s employment is terminated, or this MOU is terminated by SANDAG, SANDAG shall reimburse Port District its proportionate share of funds contributed for the applicable year of the employment contract between SANDAG and Employee.
4. Employee shall report to the SANDAG Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning (Planning Director). The Planning Director shall meet with designated staff members from the Port District to confer regarding the selection of the Employee and the selection of work assignments for the Employee.

5. Port District shall provide input to the Planning Director regarding Employee’s performance. Should Employee fail to perform satisfactorily, the parties will consult with each other concerning whether terminations of SANDAG’s contract with Employee and/or this MOU are appropriate.

6. In case of any unforeseen circumstances or a dispute relating to this MOU, SANDAG and Port District will meet in good faith to resolve issues.

7. This MOU shall commence effective on the date set forth above and shall continue until three years after Employee is hired for the Position, or until one of the parties elects to terminate the MOU, whichever occurs first. Port District or SANDAG may terminate this MOU by providing the other party written notification of intent to terminate. Termination becomes effective 60 days after receipt of such notification.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments

BRUCE HOLLINGSWORTH
Executive Director
San Diego Unified Port District

APPROVED AS TO LEGALITY AND FORM:

SANDAG Office of General Counsel

Legal Counsel for Port District
The Borders Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase II Final Draft Report and submission of the Report to Caltrans.

**Introduction**

SANDAG and the Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG) received a grant from Caltrans to pursue a second phase of the Interstate 15 (I-15) Interregional Partnership (IRP). The emphasis for this phase was on implementing specific economic development, transportation, and housing and land use strategies that were identified in the first phase of the project. On January 29, 2007, the I-15 Interregional Partnership Joint Policy Committee received and accepted the Final Draft Report for this phase. On March 23, 2007, the Borders Committee reviewed and approved the I-15 IRP Phase II Final Draft Report and Appendices included in this agenda packet and is forwarding it to the Board of Directors for final approval.

**Discussion**

**I-15 IRP**

The I-15 IRP was formed in 2001 to address the imbalance of jobs and housing that has developed between the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County in the past decade and the lengthy interregional commutes that have resulted. The I-15 IRP is a voluntary compact between local elected officials representing SANDAG and the WRCOG, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA). Caltrans and other affected governmental agencies and private sector organizations also participate in the partnership.

The primary goal of the I-15 IRP is to foster collaborative strategies in economic development, transportation, and housing that will improve the quality of life of residents in both counties. The partnership promotes a more sustainable land use pattern by providing appropriate employment closer to where people live and more affordable housing closer to employment in job-rich areas throughout the study corridor. By doing so, workers would have more opportunities to live closer to work, reducing the need for long distance interregional commuting.

**Phase I Background**

Phase I of the I-15 IRP was funded by a grant from the State Department of Housing and Community Development. The focus of the first phase, based on a three-year work plan, was to: develop a policy structure and mechanism for technical support; explore existing conditions; understand the interregional commuter problem; identify current programs to resolve interregional issues; forecast commute conditions; develop strategies to better balance jobs and housing; and establish an implementation and monitoring process.
Phase II Accomplishments

Phase II, funded by a grant from Caltrans, sought to strengthen and expand the scope of the interregional institutional arrangement between SANDAG and WRCOG. The emphasis was to extend the interregional planning agenda into the area of economic development through the implementation of an employment cluster study, while at the same time working together to implement strategies in the areas of transportation and housing that were identified in the Phase I effort. The purpose of the agreement was to test the capabilities of the two regions to collaborate on major projects affecting both jurisdictions that are compatible with the principles and framework of the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the WRCOG Growth Visioning Plan.

Phase II of the I-15 IRP also focused on implementing short-term strategies in all of the policy areas, as well as laying the foundation for the implementation of various long-term strategies.

Economic Development

During Phase II, an Economic Development Working Group was formed to provide a structure for pursuing long-term, cooperative economic development strategies. A major contribution to the economic development strategy was the completion of a two-county Employment Cluster Study. Data already exists for the San Diego region, but in order to analyze how the two economies are related it was necessary to gather data in the same format for Riverside County. The study identified key clusters shared by both economies and provided recommendations on how to pursue collaborative economic development strategies. It identified specific area in which the two regions should coordinate infrastructure planning and public policy to support the growth of these common clusters for the mutual prosperity of both regions.

Transportation

Progress was made on both short- and long-term strategies identified in Phase I of the I-15 IRP. A major cooperative study was undertaken by Caltrans Districts 8 and 11 to assist San Diego and southwestern Riverside Counties to better understand the infrastructure needs for improvements to I-15 at the county line. In addition, progress was made on interregional cooperation on various short-term strategies including: transportation demand management (TDM); expanding park and ride facilities; and joint outreach and marketing for transit, vanpools, and ridesharing. In addition, longer-term options, such as a high-speed rail service in the I-15 corridor were discussed. RCTC is currently implementing a feasibility study in this area.

Housing Strategy

The focus of the housing strategy during Phase II was to provide a summary of housing and land use programs that could be implemented in the San Diego region and southwestern Riverside County. SANDAG developed the Smart Growth Concept Map which is now being considered by Riverside jurisdictions as a tool for developing smart growth planning near transit. SANDAG developed the scope of work for a workforce housing pilot study which will be implemented in a future phase of the I-15 IRP. The SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group was established to promote the use of smart growth planning along the SPRINTER light rail line in northern San Diego County. Both regions also are discussing ways to collaborate on smart growth planning.
The attached report summarizes the results of Phase II of the I-15 IRP (Attachment 1). In addition, full versions of the Employment Cluster Study (Appendix A) and the Cooperative County Line Study (Appendix B) are available online at the I-15 IRP Web site (www.i15irp.org). Additionally, hard copies can be obtained upon request to the SANDAG Public Information Office.

**Next Steps**

Significant advances have been made during Phase II of the I-15 IRP that address issues of mutual concern between San Diego and southwestern Riverside Counties. Phase II demonstrated the ability of the two regions to work together on collaborative strategies involving more coordination in existing programs and identified some longer-term strategies such as those identified in the pursuit of a coordinated economic development program.

It is recommended that the collaboration between the two regions continue through various mechanisms, as discussed in the final draft report (pp. 57-59). First, both SANDAG and WRCOG have incorporated certain tasks related to the interregional partnership into their proposed Overall Work Programs (OWP) to ensure that resources, however limited, are dedicated to the continuation of the partnership. It also is recommended that the Joint Policy Advisory Committee remain in place and convene at least twice a year to receive reports on advances made on the IRP strategies. This will ensure that progress is made within existing programs and projects, as well as provide the policy structure should specific new initiatives receive funding. Several grant proposals have been submitted to Caltrans through both Districts 8 and 11 to provide grant funding for specific aspects for future I-15 IRP components.

Second, agency staff will continue to coordinate efforts in existing programs that are relevant to the objectives of the I-15 IRP program. It will be important to continue to meet periodically at a staff level to clarify areas in which SANDAG and agencies in southwestern Riverside County can collaborate on mutually beneficial programs already underway.

Third, SANDAG and WRCOG are developing grant proposals to support various aspects of the I-15 IRP, including developing an interregional transit service plan, economic development coordination, and promotion of workforce housing initiatives.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

**Attachment:** 1. IRP Phase II Final Draft Report, March 2007

**Key Staff Contact:** Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909, jcl@sandag.org
FY 2007 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM
AMENDMENT: REGIONAL ENERGY PLANNING PROGRAM

Introduction

In April 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors discussed the future of the SANDAG Regional Energy Planning Program. The Board acknowledged the significant accomplishments made by SANDAG through its Regional Energy Strategy (RES) and Energy Working Group (EWG). Board members agreed that the agency should make a long-term commitment to this program. The Board also agreed that SANDAG staff should continue to pursue external funding sources in support of its regional planning activities. This Board direction was incorporated into the FY 2007 SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program, and staff has pursued several funding opportunities, including partnership opportunities with the California Energy Commission (CEC).

Discussion

SANDAG has been coordinating with the CEC to identify partnership opportunities in regional energy planning. The CEC has decided to focus on the relationship between land use, transportation, and energy planning as part of its energy blueprint planning process and has elected to work with SANDAG to develop analytical tools and research in this area. The CEC considers “smart growth” to be the most significant opportunity to meet energy and climate change goals.

The CEC has approved two separate energy planning contracts for SANDAG: one on March 28, 2007 ($50,000), and a second on April 11, 2007 ($400,000). The former is a one-year grant that will enable SANDAG to research and write a chapter of the RES that will encourage energy efficient building practices, as recommended under the U.S. Department of Energy Rebuild America program. The latter is a two-year contract that will assist SANDAG in carrying out FY 2007 and FY 2008 OWP tasks to update the RES, assist member agencies to participate in energy efficiency programs, and participate in state energy planning processes on behalf of the region.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to amend the FY 2007 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept $450,000 in funding, under two contracts, from the California Energy Commission (CEC) to assist in implementing the Regional Energy Planning Program. The Board of Directors also is asked to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a revenue agreement with the CEC.
One-Year “Rebuild America” Grant

As part of the update of the RES, SANDAG will prepare a report section that includes measures that will encourage the energy efficient design of new nonresidential buildings. The Rebuild America program is a network of community-based partnerships across the nation that are committed to saving energy, improving building performance, easing air pollution through reduced energy demand, and enhancing the quality of life through energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.

Two-Year Energy and Climate Change Planning Contract

The partnership will assist SANDAG in updating the RES, developing a climate change action plan, developing an alternative transportation vehicles and fuels toolkit for local governments, and expanding a pilot Sustainable Region program to assist local governments with saving energy. The work effort will contribute to state energy planning through the CEC Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) process. The EWG will serve as the local advisory committee to this CEC partnership. Updates will be provided to the Regional Planning Committee and Board, and input from other working groups will be solicited over the course of this partnership.

With these funds, SANDAG will develop analytical tools for coordinated land use, energy, climate change, and alternative fuels research. The research and tools that are developed will provide guidance and information for California's local governments to incorporate energy and climate considerations into their planning, development, and infrastructure deployment programs.

These revenue agreements with the CEC will leverage existing funds provided by SANDAG and San Diego Gas and Electric. This also will fund a limited-term associate planner, an intern, and added consultant services to complete the work effort through the third quarter of FY 2009.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Amended FY 2007 OWP 3003000 and Budget

Key Staff Contact: Susan Freedman, (619) 699-7387, sfr@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3003000
**PROGRAM WORK ELEMENT: 30030.1**

**TITLE: REGIONAL ENERGY PLANNING AND COORDINATION**

**FY 2007 BUDGET: $338,398**

**STRATEGIC GOAL: ENCOURAGE QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source*</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09-11</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA MPO Planning (5303)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Transit Planning (5307)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA CMAQ</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal-State Other</strong>**</td>
<td>$8,323</td>
<td>$41,677</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Other</strong>*</td>
<td>$333,332</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$166,668</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Assessment</td>
<td>$238,398</td>
<td>$228,153</td>
<td>$228,153*</td>
<td>$694,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Other****</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000**</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$380,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>$338,398</strong></td>
<td><strong>$569,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>$494,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This work element was previously represented as annual, not multi-year budget. One new revenue agreement runs from May 1, 2007 – April 30, 2009, spanning FY 07 – FY 09, therefore multiple years are now shown.

** California Energy Commission, Rebuild America grant ($50,000)**

** California Energy Commission, regional energy and climate planning 2-year revenue agreement ($400,000)**

** Assumes same Member Assessment and Local Other contribution in FY 2009 as in FY 2008.**

** Assumes San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) revenues of $100,000 per year through FY 2009.**
### Funds Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09-11</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits,</td>
<td>$213,398</td>
<td>$195,753</td>
<td>$0366,525</td>
<td>$925,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$5,0009,855</td>
<td>$7,40024,052</td>
<td>$024,296</td>
<td>$58,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$156,800</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$460,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through/In-kind</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$380,053</td>
<td>$338,398</td>
<td>$303,153</td>
<td>$1,444,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBJECTIVE

The objectives of this work element are to: (1) coordinate implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy; (2) work with federal and state energy planning and regulating agencies to help the region attain energy self-sufficiency; and (3) integrate transportation energy planning issues into Regional Energy Planning efforts.

### PREVIOUS AND ONGOING WORK

SANDAG established the Energy Working Group (EWG), under the Regional Planning Committee, which began the process of developing the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy in April 2004. The Regional Energy Strategy is incorporated into the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and is implemented through this work element. In FY 2006, the Energy Working Group focused its efforts on the development of the 2006 Long-Term Resource Plan (Plan), which is a long-range planning document prepared by San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) to identify how the company plans to meet electricity demand over the next ten years. The Draft Plan was submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission by SDG&E in December mid-2006.

Committee(s): Regional Planning Committee; Working Group: Energy Working Group; Project Manager – Rob Rundle, Susan Freedman
## PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF MANDATE</th>
<th>TASK / PRODUCT DESCRIPTION(S) / SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDATED</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Pending funding availability, the Energy Working Group will continue to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy, assist in the coordination of regional energy planning in the San Diego region and with Baja California, Mexico and other counties, and promote energy self sufficiency and conservation.
STATE ROUTE 52 CORRIDOR UPDATE

Introduction

The TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) SR 52 corridor projects include operational improvements, a freeway extension, and freeway widening to accommodate high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lanes. Caltrans has identified significant cost increases to the projects in the SR 52 Corridor. A value engineering study was conducted to help control cost increases as well as two independent cost/risk studies were performed and both of the studies validated the current cost estimates.

This report outlines reasons for the cost increases and presents options for managing these cost increases within the established budget for the SR 52 Corridor. On April 18, 2007, Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the SR 52 Corridor projects and unanimously recommended approval of Option A (discussed below). ITOC also raised concerns about the recent rising capital cost increases on TransNet EAP projects and asked for further discussion at future meetings.

Discussion

SR 52 corridor improvements extend ten miles from Interstate 15 (I-15) in the City of San Diego to SR 67 in the City of Santee. A map of the SR 52 Corridor is shown in Attachment 1. There are three projects in the SR 52 corridor. These include the SR 52 Operational Improvements, SR 52 Extension, and SR 52 Managed Lanes projects. The following provides the current status of the projects as well as options for managing cost increases within the established budget for the SR 52 corridor.

SR 52 Operational Improvements

The segment of SR 52 between I-15 and the Mast Boulevard interchange in the City of Santee experiences congestion in both the morning and evening commute periods. SR 52 has two through lanes and a third lane for truck climbing purposes in the steep uphill stretches in each direction. Two projects are being developed to address freeway operational deficiencies in this area.
• SR 52 Westbound Auxiliary Lane: A third westbound lane is currently under construction and will extend the existing lane from just west of the Mission Trails Summit to Santo Road. Construction is estimated to be complete in May 2007. This project has a current total cost of $6.2 million. This project is on schedule and within budget.

• SR 52 Eastbound/Westbound Auxiliary Lane: The third westbound lane will be extended from Santo Road to I-15. In addition, the third eastbound lane will be extended from just east of the Mission Trails Summit to Mast Boulevard. Approval of the environmental document is anticipated in April 2007. Construction of this project is expected to begin in October 2007 and to be complete in April 2009. This project has a current total cost of $43.2 million. This project is on schedule and within budget.

The total budget for the SR 52 Operational Improvements project is $56.8 million. The current total cost estimate of these operational improvements is $49.4 million, meaning there is a current surplus of $7.4 million.

**SR 52 Extension**

This project will construct the final four-mile section of the SR 52 freeway. SR 52 will be extended from where it now ends at SR 125, east to the junction with SR 67. The design includes two general purpose through lanes in each direction, plus a third auxiliary lane in each direction between interchanges. Freeway-to-freeway connectors are proposed at the SR 52/SR 125 and SR 52/SR 67 interchanges. Local interchanges are proposed at Fanita Drive, Cuyamaca Street, and Magnolia Avenue.

The environmental reevaluations for the project were approved by the Federal Highway Administration in July 2006 and November 2006. The SR 52 crossing at Cuyamaca Street was approved by the California Public Utilities Commission on March 15, 2007.

Construction will be completed with three separate construction contracts: Unit 4 (from SR 125 to Cuyamaca Street); Unit 5A (from Magnolia Avenue to SR 67); and Unit 5B (from Cuyamaca Street to Magnolia Avenue). Construction is scheduled to begin in late 2007 and complete in late 2010.

A comprehensive update of the project costs was recently completed. Significant increases in the construction costs for bridges, retaining walls, earthwork, roadway, and the contractor’s time-related overhead were identified. Time-related overhead is daily cost of the Contractor's field office and home office overhead required to administer a construction project. The cost estimates were reviewed for quality and accuracy. Two independent cost/risk studies were completed, validating the current cost estimates. The total project cost is currently estimated at $599.5 million, a $128.9 million increase over the $470.6 million budget. The table below provides a breakdown of the major areas of increase.
Cost Estimate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Areas</th>
<th>Prior Cost (Millions)</th>
<th>Current Cost (Millions)</th>
<th>Total Cost (Millions)</th>
<th>Increase due to Construction Costs (Millions)</th>
<th>Increase due to Scope (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>$37.8</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
<td>$20.5</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$25.7</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>$57.4</td>
<td>$90.1</td>
<td>$32.7</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Related Overhead</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$24.2</td>
<td>$24.2</td>
<td>$24.2</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>$93.5</td>
<td>$115.0</td>
<td>$21.5</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Support</td>
<td>$92.5</td>
<td>$101.2</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Capital</td>
<td>$205.5</td>
<td>$205.5</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$470.6</td>
<td>$599.5</td>
<td>$128.9</td>
<td>$85.7</td>
<td>$43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost reduction strategies are currently being implemented. These strategies include trimming nonessential features from the project scope and coordinating earthwork activities with other public and private projects. A large amount of import borrow (imported soil) is needed to create the roadbed and fill slopes for the SR 52 Extension project. The SR 52 Extension project site has been made available to other projects looking to dispose of material that meets specifications and can be used for fill purposes. This will reduce the amount of import borrow needed for the SR 52 Extension project and its cost.

SR 52 Managed Lanes

Caltrans is currently developing the environmental document for the SR 52 HOV/managed Lanes between I-805 and SR 125. The segment between I-15 and SR 125 is part of the TransNet Early Action Program. This segment would be widened to provide three general purpose lanes in each direction, and two reversible managed lanes. The reversible managed lanes would operate westbound during the morning commute, and eastbound during the evening commute. A major environmental challenge for the project will be the construction of an additional bridge in the median across the San Diego River. Approval of the environmental document is planned for late 2009. The Project Study Report (PSR) was approved on March 27, 2007. The cost estimate for the SR 52 Managed Lanes project is $283 million, $91.8 million over the $191.2 million budget.

Next Steps

In order to move forward on the SR 52 Extension project, two options were presented to the Transportation Committee for consideration.

Option A would construct the entire SR 52 Extension project from SR 125 to SR 67, including the freeway-to-freeway interchange at SR 67. Funds would be moved from the SR 52 Managed Lanes project to the SR 52 Extension project to cover the cost increases. The SR 52 Managed Lanes project would retain funding for the project engineering phase, including the completion of the environmental document. However, the design, right-of-way, and construction phases for the SR 52
Managed Lanes project would be unfunded. Regional funding priorities will be reestablished with the update to the Regional Transportation Plan that is underway.

Option A

Option B would down scope the SR 52 Extension project by deferring the construction of the SR 52/SR 67 freeway-to-freeway interchange. Under Option B, an at-grade traffic signal controlled intersection would be constructed at SR 52 and Magnolia Avenue. A southbound SR 67 on-ramp from SR 52/Magnolia Avenue also would be constructed. Option B would require additional studies to assess project changes and impacts, particularly to the local arterials. These additional studies would result in a one-year delay to the project.
Option B

Approval of either option will allow the SR 52 Extension project to move forward as well as the SR 52 Operational Improvements project to be completed. However, either option will result in a funding shortfall for the SR 52 Managed Lanes project. Option A results in a shortfall amount of $213,231 million for the Managed Lanes project, and Option B results in a shortfall amount of $109,731 million. The calculation of these shortfall amounts is shown in the table below.

### SR 52 Managed Lanes Project Shortfall Amounts ($thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Option A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Improvements</td>
<td>$56,835</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>-$7,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$470,644</td>
<td>$599,500</td>
<td>$128,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Lanes</td>
<td>$191,190</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$91,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$718,669</td>
<td>$931,900</td>
<td><strong>$213,231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Option B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Improvements</td>
<td>$56,835</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>-$7,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>$470,644</td>
<td>$496,000</td>
<td>$25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Lanes</td>
<td>$191,190</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$91,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$718,669</td>
<td>$828,400</td>
<td><strong>$109,731</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommended Option**

The SR 52 Extension project, which is ready to go to construction, has a shortfall of approximately $128.9 million. Under Option A, the full SR 52 Extension Project, a “Tier 1” priority from the original TransNet local sales tax measure, would be able to move forward. Staff recommends moving $128.9 million from the Managed Lanes project to the Extension Project in order to allow this Tier 1 project to be built on schedule. Under Option A, the environmental phase of the SR 52 Managed Lanes project would be completed, and then the project would be ready for additional project funding when identified. Option B is not recommended, as it will delay both the Extension and Managed Lanes projects, will require additional funding because of the need for additional project studies, and will impact local traffic patterns.

All public works projects are currently grappling with escalating costs over approved budget amounts. Options for managing cost increases for the other TransNet EAP corridors will be presented at upcoming Transportation Committee meetings.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Map of SR 52 Corridor

Key Staff Contact: Joel Haven, (619) 220-7377, Joel_Haven@dot.ca.gov
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March 2007

• 2030 Unconstrained Network = +$80B
• Draft project rankings
• Initial RTP funding scenarios
• Revenue Constrained = $40.6B
  – Conservative approach of traditional resources – federal requirement
  – Specific network and services
  – Start with the 2006 RC update
March 2007

• Reasonably Expected Revenues
  – More aggressive scenario with higher level of investment
  – MOBILITY 2030 based on Reasonably Expected scenario: + $12B
  – Provide more congestion relief
  – Funding sources can be general
  – Choose level of investment for 2007

Board Direction

• Commitment to TransNet EAP and HOV/ML system
• Final project evaluation results as basis for priorities
• $4B and $10B level of investment for Reasonably Expected
• Test balanced approach along with transit & highway emphases
Revenue Constrained Scenario

Draft 2007 Revenue Constrained Highway Network

- I-5
- I-805
- SR 11
- SR 94/125
Changes to Initial 2007 Revenue Constrained Highway Network

Remove from RC:
• SR 56
• SR 94/125 HOV

Add to RC:
• Extend I-5 HOV

Draft 2007 Revenue Constrained Transit Network

• I-15 to Sorrento Mesa and downtown
• Coaster
• Mid-Coast LRT & Super Loop
• Otay Mesa to Sorrento Mesa & downtown BRT
Draft 2007 Revenue Constrained Transit Network

- Sprinter
- Blue Line
- Orange Line
- Green Line
- El Cajon Blvd
- Rapid Bus

Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios
Approach

- $4B and $10B
- Use final project rankings
- Finish high-priority corridor improvements
- Package complementary projects

Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios

- Option 1  $ 4B Balanced
- Option 2A  $10B Balanced
- Option 2B  $10B Highway Emphasis
- Option 2C  $10B Transit Emphasis
2030 Regional Peak-Period Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Uncongested Freeway VMT</th>
<th>Number of Transit Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Percent Uncongested Freeway VMT**
- **Number of Transit Boardings**

$10 Billion Level of Investment

**RE Option 2A Highway**

- Focus on Priority Corridors
- Balanced approach
$10 Billion Level of Investment

RE Option 2A Transit

- Existing Services
- Major Capital Facilities
- New Rapid Bus and BRT Services

Additional Reasonably Expected Improvement

- Add I-5 and I-15 North Center Lanes as Toll Lanes
Recommended Additions to the Reasonably Expected Scenario

- I-5 and I-15 ML North to County line – Toll facilities
- $2B for Local Agency Improvements
- $3B for Goods Movement Projects
  - Separate funding sources
  - Priorities from regional GMAP

---

Recommended Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonably Expected Scenario</th>
<th>RE Base</th>
<th>RE Level of Investment</th>
<th>Toll Lanes I-5/I-15</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
<th>Local Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2A</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Committee Recommendation

- Accept Revenue Constrained Scenario for draft RTP
- Accept a $58B Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario that includes the following:
  - $51B balanced allocation
  - $2B I-5 and I-15 North improvements as toll facilities
  - $2B local share
  - $3B goods movement package
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Rally held in City Heights for new transit system

Many want promises kept

By: J. Carlos Rico

Hundreds of people came together in City Heights to show their support that a (promise be) kept. Last Tuesday, April 10, the City Heights Community Development Corporation held a rally at the City Heights Transit Plaza, above the Interstate 15 University Avenue bridge to inform everyone about what is going on with the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system.

The Centerline Rapid Transit System is a plan to build a state-of-the-art bus system in the center of the Interstate 15 that would get Mid-City San Diego residents to downtown in 10 minutes and up to North County job centers quickly. The transit plazas at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard are planned to be major stops to board the system, with access via elevators to stations in the center of the freeway. This transit system is similar to a subway system and has been implemented in other cities like Ottawa, Canada, and future implementation in Los Angeles.

As far back as 1985, residents were promised a portion of Interstate 15 would serve as a “regional asset” and “catalyst for neighborhood renewal,” according to the City Heights Community Development Corporation. This was when the freeway was in the planning stages to go through Mid-City. Now there are talks that SANDAG, which stands for San Diego Association of Governments, want to build carpool lanes and truck lanes instead of Rapid Transit System, which would be located in the center of the freeway.

“Promises were made a long time ago,” Carl Williams said. “They need to be kept.”

The transit service plan that would carry out this promise was adopted as part of the 2003 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Now this summer, the 2007 plan is being prepared for approval and residents of City Heights want the BRT system not to be forgotten. “Cal Trans has conducted a study that concludes if an HOV or freight truck lanes are designated for use on Interstate 15, it would prevent the Centerline Rapid Transit System and stations from being constructed,” Executive Director of City Heights Community Development Corporation Jay Powell said.

Furthermore, Cal Trans has said the Mid-City segment of the interstate 15 would not need these two designations until 2030. Many of those whose were at the rally also attended the city’s Land Use and Housing Committee meeting the next day, where many echoed the same sentiment of wanting a rapid transit system. “We need the Centerlines going,” Maria Cortez said. “I would like to go to the north and the south downtown without it taking two hours.” In addition, the two transit plazas at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard have facilities already built to house vendors and business, which many residents say is an easy target for vandalism and graffiti. Another reason for the need of this rapid transit system is so that students can get to schools in the North County. Many residents of City Heights go to school outside of the area from which they live and many see this as an easier and more efficient way to get to school.

Many residents also said that the BRT would benefit by helping the environment by reducing the amount of smog and other pollutants caused by too many automobiles. “We have a reality check here,” Elisa Campos said. “If we have a better transportation system, it would benefit everyone. There would be less pollution because there would be less cars on the freeway and more people using rapid transportation.” Not only are many of the residents on board with this project, but city, state and federal elected officials have also shown their support for this transportation system. Among those at the rally were representatives from Congresswomen Susan A. Davis and councilmember Toni Atkins. “I stand and support this project and the agreement the state and Cal Trans made with the residents of City Heights and the city of San Diego,” Lori Saldana said in a statement.

At this council committee meeting, Councilmember Jim Madaffer, Toni Atkins and Tony Young showed support for this project and told those in attendance to give them some time so they can meet with Cal Trans, MTS and SANDAG and act on what the residents want. For now, all the players need to get involved because the community has spoken loud and clear and said they want this project and a promised kept. If you would like more information or get involved you can go to www.CenterLineTransit.com

Reprint provided by City Heights Community Development Corporation (CHCDO); transit@cityheights HDC.org or call (619) 584-1535 for more information.
SR-15 CENTERLINE RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM AND STATIONS

INTRODUCTION:

- Construction of State Route 15 through Mid-City was a watershed event for this community, which long suffered impacts of 35,000 cars per day passing through its neighborhoods on surface streets.

- Recognizing the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this project, the design of this freeway segment was intensely negotiated with the community with the goal of making the new freeway both a regional asset and a catalyst for neighborhood renewal.

- Many design amenities resulted from this process, including the dedication of the freeway median for the exclusive use of rapid transit, and expanded over-crossings at the interchanges of SR-15 at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard to serve as transit plazas.

- These commitments and mitigations were codified in Memoranda of Understanding and Agreement between CalTrans and the City of San Diego and other agencies, most notably in 1985-1993 timeframe.

- The transit service plans that would fulfill this promise were adopted as part of SANDAG’s Mobility 2030

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES:

- The draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update recommended by SANDAG staff and Transportation Committee includes funding for the CenterLine Rapid Transit System and Stations through Mid City San Diego AND for special connector lanes to I-805 and SR-94.

- The current RTP and the proposed 2007 RTP continue to include designations of HOV lanes and a designation for Goods Movement Action Plan through the Mid City I-15 corridor.

- Caltrans studies have determined that incorporation of HOV lanes through Mid City segment of I-15 are not needed through 2030 and that designation of HOV lanes and/or Goods Movement lanes in this constrained corridor would conflict with the commitment to provide dedicated transit lanes, stations and enclosed platforms for the CenterLine BRT.

ACTION NEEDED:

- Support the 2007 RTP recommendation to include full funding for the CenterLine Rapid Transit dedicated lanes and stations and enclosed platforms to be accessed from the newly-constructed Mid-City Transit Gateways on the Transit Plazas at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard crossing of I-15 freeway

- Support the 2007 RTP recommendation to phase in connector lanes and facilities from I-15 to I-805 and SR-94 as necessary

- Adopt Goods Movement plan that includes alternatives to additional truck traffic through Mid City segment of I-15

- Eliminate the HOV designation on additional lanes created for rapid transit in the Mid-City I-15 corridor

For more information please go to www.CenterLineTransit.com or contact transit@cityheightscdc.org
Transportation Fact Sheet

Transit Facts:
- Nationally only 4.3% of miles on our road system are served by transit
- The values of aggregate benefits from transit related congestion relief at $19.4 billion annually.
- $1 of public funds invested in public transportation returns up to $6 in economic benefits for urban regions.
- Urban rail systems can provide more capacity in a 100 ft. right-of-way than a six lane freeway requiring a 300 ft right of way
- 1 full rail car removes 200 cars from the road
- 1 full bus removes 60 cars from the road
- 1 full van removes 12 cars from the road

Source: American Public Transit Association "Critical Relief for Traffic Congestion"
http://www.apta.com 2003

Transportation Infrastructure Regionally:
- In San Diego there is an 8:1 imbalance of freeway infrastructure to transit infrastructure.
- San Diego County has over 300 miles of freeways and 1,875 freeway lane miles as well as 7,150 miles of roads and streets.
- The County has 180 miles of fixed guide-way urban transit and 220 track miles of fixed guide-way rail transit.

Source: Bureau of Transportation Statistics http://www.bts.gov 2004

- 90% of new highway capacity in California's metropolitan areas is filled within 4 years.
- 60 to 70% of all new county highways are filled within 2 years of completion.


Cost of Automobiles in San Diego County:
- $6,000/yr - in Operation, maintenance, insurance, and depreciation: $1.19 per mile driven
- 53 hr/yr - SD resident's ave. loss due to auto congestion
- $1.8 billion - Total loss in fuel, time and productivity in SD ($865 per capita)
- Financial costs of accidents is roughly $3.24 billion per year (based on NHTSA statistics including productivity lost, workers comp claims, insurance, etc).

Health and Social Costs:
- 290 auto related deaths in San Diego County in 2003
- 30,000 auto accidents with 24,280 injuries in San Diego County in 2003

Auto Dependence:
- Between 1980 and 2000 97% increase in vehicle miles traveled while only a 42% increase in population

Auto Facts:
- Consumes 1/4 of urban land area
- Consumes 2/3 of oil-based energy 850,000 gallons per day
- Undermines public health, causing respiratory problems and obesity.
- Creates unsustainable costs.
- Results in social inequities, as automobiles are less accessible to the young, the elderly and the poor.
- Forecloses on smart growth redevelopment.
- Results in an unconscionable number of fatalities and injuries on the roads (294 auto-related deaths, 24,617 injuries in San Diego County in 2004)


San Diego Regional Association of Governments:
*-Independent Transit Planning Review May 2006. Chapter 6 page 3, Chapter 5 page 19

PPIC Special Survey of San Diego County July 2000:
- 78% of San Diegans name, "traffic congestion on freeways and major roads" as a serious problem in San Diego.
- 75% feel the reason for problems in San Diego is the, "Government spending money on the wrong things."
- 89% name, "Making a big effort to reduce corruption in government" will help solve the serious problems in San Diego.
- 85% name, "Building a superior public transit system, so that people have an incentive to use mass transit instead of their cars" will help solve the serious problems in San Diego.

Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act 2007 (S. 294):
- Lautenberg introduced this 6 year bill to provide $19.2 billion for Amtrak.
- "Provides the national intercity passenger railroad $3.2 billion annually: $1.9 billion annual appropriations, $1.3 billion bond authority, average of $300 million in capital grants to be allocated to states annually."

Source: http://www.progressiverailroading.com/freightnews/article.asp?id=10083

Highways and Induced Travel Demand:
- "It is clear that land development and traffic growth follows highway construction. When highway capacity is increased, generally it has quickly filled with increased traffic flow".
- "DeCorla-Souza and Cohen define this "induced demand" as an: "increase in daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT), with reference to a specific geographic context, resulting from expansion of highway capacity." This definition includes both short-term effects and long-term effects. The short-term effects include more trips, longer trips, more auto trips, and auto trips with lower occupancies. The long-term effects follow land used changes caused by expanded roadway capacity".
- "1.0 percent increase in lane miles induces a 0.9 percent increase in VMT [Vehicle Miles Traveled] within five years. With so much induced traffic, adding new road capacity does little to reduce congestion."

Source: http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/how_transit_benefits.cfm

SAVE OUR FOREST AND RANCHLANDS

P.O. Box 475
Descanso, Ca 91916
619.445.9638
Fax 619.390.8641
sofar@nether.com
www.SOFAR.org
ONLINE COMMUNITY NEWS ARTICLES

- Local Shred It event coming
- Drug abuse - Part 1 - How high is your education?
- Drug abuse - Part II - The gay community
- Crime on San Diego Public Transit - How safe are you?
- Target of lawsuits: local business owners being targeted
- Government visits Hillcrest Hospital - Addressing health care programs
- Those Antitox Boxes - The painting of our areas electrical boxes
- Dining out for life - Beginning the county's HIV/AIDS prevention
- Lincoln High Enrollment Event - Info, dates & times
- A City Heights Community Garden - Learn how you can help
- Fairmount Park Neighborhood Association - 5th Annual Yard Sale
- Rally held in City Heights - Transit system desires
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Many want promises kept

Rally held in City Heights for new transit system

Local Community Meeting Schedule

Heights

Public Right-of-Way Enhancement Program - Changes for City

T-Shirt design contest - LET is looking to an artist

By: J. Carlos Rico
Like more information or get involved you can go to www.csusd.com.

The school board has approved the 2007-2008 school year budget. The budget includes $113 million for instructional services, $15 million for facilities and maintenance, and $5 million for technology.

The budget also includes $30 million for transportation and $20 million for student activities. The budget will be presented to the board at its next meeting on May 15th.
The Worst of all Possible Worlds

40 sq mi parking

Rancho Guejito
From A study by economists Robert Shapiro and Kevin Hassett:

- If Americans used transit for 10 percent of their transportation needs the U.S. would reduce its dependence on foreign oil by more than 40 percent.

- Per passenger mile, public transportation at today’s usage level is twice as fuel efficient as private automobiles, and three times as efficient as SUV travel.

William Millar
Environmental and Energy Study Institute Briefing
http://www.eesi.org/briefings/2006/Transp&SmartGrowth/3.8.06Transit/3.8.06Transit.htm

Transportation Facts:

- In San Diego there is an 8:1 imbalance of freeway infrastructure to transit infrastructure.
- 90% of new highway capacity in California’s metropolitan areas is filled within 4 years.
- 60-70% of all new county highways are filled within 2 years of completion.
- $1.8 billion = total loss in fuel, time and productivity in San Diego.
- $3.24 billion = cost of accidents per year in SD.
- Autos consume 1/4 of urban land area and 2/3 of oil based energy (~850,000 gallons per day).
- $1 of public funds invested in public transportation returns up to $6 in economic benefits for urban regions.
- 1 full rail car removes 200 cars from the roadway.
Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act 2007 (S. 294)

- Lautenberg introduced this 6 year bill to provide $19.2 billion for Amtrak.
- “Provides the national intercity passenger railroad $3.2 billion annually: $1.9 billion annual appropriations, $1.3 billion bond authority, average of $300 million in capital grants to be allocated to states annually.”

http://www.progressiverailroading.com/freightnews/article.asp?id=10083

Highways and Induced Travel Demand:

- “It is clear that land development and traffic growth follows highway construction. When highway capacity is increased, generally it has quickly filled with increased traffic flow”.
- “DeCorla-Souza and Cohen define this “induced demand” as an: “increase in daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT), with reference to a specific geographic context, resulting from expansion of highway capacity.” This definition includes both short-term effects and long-term effects. The short-term effects include more trips, longer trips, more auto trips, and auto trips with lower occupancies. The long-term effects follow land used changes caused by expanded roadway capacity”.
- “1.0 percent increase in lane miles induces a 0.9 percent increase in VMT [Vehicle Miles Traveled] within five years. With so much induced traffic, adding new road capacity does little to reduce congestion.”

http://www.apta.com/research/info/online/how_transit_benefits.cfm
UPA Proposal

The “Effects 5/21” Program

Opportunity – US DOT’s Urban Partnership Agreement

- Comprehensive congestion reduction strategies
- Innovative, bold, & comprehensive approaches
- Partners given priority access to funding
- Large scale deployments and pilots
- Focus is on effects
- $1 billion available
UPA Funding Programs

Urban Partnerships Agreement

- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS-OTMC)
- Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP)
- Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Program
  - New Starts/Small Starts Program
  - Bus & Bus Facilities Program
  - Alternatives Analysis Program

Proposal Concepts
Value Pricing on Managed Lanes, Connectors, and Ramps
(Technology, Tolling)

Goal: Reduce ramp queue backup

- FasTrak system expansion to ramps and connectors
- Reduce backup onto city streets
- Continue delivery of choice services
- Evaluation of other pricing technologies

SWOOP
(Transit, Technology, Tolling)
Goal: Competitive transit service

- New South Bay BRT route
- Advanced lane-keeping technology
- Small number of selected freight operators
- Value-priced services
- Evaluate sustainable business model
Smart Parking
(Transit, Technology, Tolling)

Goal: Increase transit ridership

- Parking information and reservation system
- Coaster station pilot
- Develop business model for transit parking expansion

Flexible Transit & Alternative Services
(Transit)

Goal: Transit service enhancements

- Rented/leased personal electric vehicles
- Expanded car sharing and vanpool program
- First mile/last mile services
Smart Vehicles
(Technology, Tolling)

**Goal: Evaluate technologies**

- Establish a 600 vehicle test fleet
- In-vehicle Traveler Information
- Use vehicles as “probe data” sources for all roads
- Evaluate future electronic payment mechanisms
- Explore possible use of technology to support road user fees

Regional Wireless Data Network
(Transit, Technology, Tolling, Telecommuting)

**Goal: Deliver wireless network**

- Support full range of technology projects defined for the region
  - Smart vehicles and smart parking
  - Enhanced data collection
  - Public access to WiFi on transit vehicles
  - Traveler information and electronic payment
- Platform for cities enhance public safety operations
- Evaluate business model for O&M
Enhanced 511 Services
(Technology, Transit)

**Goal: Deliver decision-quality, real time information**

- Enhanced 511 services
- Smart parking
- Explore business models

Universal Transportation Account
(Technology, Tolling, Transit)

**Goal: Better customer service**

- Single payment account:
  - Transit
  - Parking
  - Tolls
- User management and analysis of transportation expenses
- Build on and enhance current FasTrak and Compass Card initiatives
- Establish a customer relationship management approach to transportation
Congestion Avoidance Rewards
(Technology, Tolling, Transit, Telecommuting)

Goal: Introduce incentive program for employers and carpoolers

- Promote rush hour peak spreading
- Reward employers for actual telecommuting by employees
- Reward carpoolers
- Evaluate “congestion avoidance rewards” approach to demand management

Integrated Performance Management
(Transit, Tolling, Technology)

Goal: Develop multimodal analysis, forecasting and management tool

- Coordinated network management
- Convert data into decisions
- Support “management of results”
- Relate results to investments
Partners

- All 18 cities and County
- USDOT
- MTS / NCTD
- Caltrans
- PATH / CCIT
- CHP
- IBM
- Motorola
- SWOOP / UPS
- ParkingCarma
- Origin Technologies
- University of Iowa

Legacy of Achievements

1996
- I-15 FasTrak Managed Lanes

1997
- AHS Demo
- I-15 Dynamic Tolling

2006
- Compass Card
- 511

2007
- Regional Transit Management System
- Regional Transit Scheduling System
- Integrated Multimodal Transportation Management System (IMTMS)
Bus Program Funds

- Three Federal Transit Administration programs
  - Fixed Guideway Modernization – Formula
  - Fixed Guideway New Starts – Discretionary for full funding grant agreements
  - Bus and Bus-Related Facilities – Discretionary
    - Total appropriation $898 million
    - Total SAFETEA-LU earmarks - $460 million
  - $438 M un-earmarked Bus Program available

Two Notices/Calls for Projects:

1. **Support for UPA**
   - “Significant Portion of Un-earmarked Funds
   - Preference Given to UPA Projects

2. **Standard Bus Discretionary Program**
   - Targeted at Improved Mobility, Access, System Integration and Efficiency
   - Preference to FTA Priorities
Bus Program Funds

Limited to bus/bus related capital:
- Purchase of buses/vans
- Maintenance/administrative facilities
- Transfer facilities
- Bus malls
- Intermodal terminals
- Park-and-ride stations
- Passenger amenities
- Miscellaneous equipment

Summary

- UPA focused on the “Big Picture”
- Funding accelerates congestion reduction efforts
- SANDAG approach focused on network management
- Innovative projects delivering results
- Region is competitive
- Support is key to our success!
Next Steps

- April 27, 2007 – SANDAG Board meeting
- April 30, 2007 – Proposal submittal UPA, ITS, VPP, TCSP
- May 4, 2007 – Bus proposal - Section 5309 Applications with specific projects presentation to Transportation Committee
- May 11, 2007 – Board of Directors Policy Meeting to approve the Section 5309 Applications
- May 22, 2007 – Proposal submittal Bus & Bus Facilities Program
- June 8, 2007 – USDOT begins negotiation with Preliminary Urban Partners
- August 8, 2007 – USDOT announcement of Urban Partnerships
- October 1, 2007 – Grant award

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG submittal of proposals for the Urban Partnership Agreements and other supporting grant opportunities.
UPA Proposal

The “Effects 5/21” Program
I-15 IRP Phase II
Final Draft Report

Board of Directors
April 27, 2007

I-15 Interregional Partnership Study Area and Corridor

Study Area
Study Corridor

I-15 Interregional Partnership

SANDAG
Strategies Pursued in Phase II

- Economic Development
- Transportation
- Housing

Economic Development Strategy

- Establishment of the Economic Development Working Group (EDWG)
- Employment Cluster Study
Transportation Strategy

- Cooperative County Line Study
- Coordinated Transit Planning
- Discussions on Vanpool Coordination
- Commuter Rail Service Study

Housing Strategy

- Smart Growth Concept Map
- Scope of Work for Pilot Feasibility Study for Workforce Housing
- SPRINTER Working Group
- Coordination with Riverside on Smart Growth Planning
Next Steps

- Overall Coordination
  - Policy
  - Executive
  - Staff
- Economic Development
- Transportation
- Housing

Recommendation

The Borders Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the I-15 Interregional Partnership Phase II Final Draft Report and submission of the Report to Caltrans.
SR 52 CORRIDOR
Project Update

Board of Directors Presentation
Agenda Item No. 13
April 27, 2007

SR 52 Corridor Status

- Corridor Update
- Cost Increases
- Reasons for Current Increases
- Options for Managing these Increases
SR 52 Corridor

- Operational Improvements
- New Freeway Segment
- HOV/Managed Lanes

Westbound Only Auxiliary Lane

- Ground Breaking: October 2006
- Final Paving: April 2007
Westbound Auxiliary Lane

Operational Project Status:
- Concrete Paving: Complete
- Open to traffic: April 07
- Project Cost: $6.2 M
- Project Budget: $8.1 M

Eastbound and Westbound Auxiliary Lane

Extends WB third lane to Santo Road

Extends WB third lane to I-15

Extends the EB third lane from the Summit to Mast Blvd.

Extends the EB third lane from the Summit to Mast Blvd.
Eastbound and Westbound Auxiliary Lane

Operational Project Status:
- Environmental Document Approval: April 07
- Construction Starts: October 07
- Open to Traffic: April 09
- Project Budget: $43.2 M

HOV/Managed Lanes
Segment 1

Project Status:
- Project Study Report Approval: March 07
- PSR Cost: $283 M
- CIP Budget: $191.2 M
- Shortfall: $91.8 M
- Evaluating Alternatives
### Construction Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>SR 125 to Cuyamaca St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 5A</td>
<td>SR 67 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 5B</td>
<td>Cuyamaca St. to SR 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ready to Go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SR 52 New Freeway Segment**

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approved At-Grade Crossing, March 15, 2007

**MTS Green Line**

**At-Grade Crossing**

---
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SR 52 New Freeway Segment

Cost Increases

- Caltrans Construction Index
- Construction Increases
- Scope Revisions
SR 52 New Freeway Segment
Identified Significant Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Areas</th>
<th>Jan-05 (Millions)</th>
<th>Dec-06 (Millions)</th>
<th>Total Cost Increase (Millions)</th>
<th>Construction Cost Increase (Millions)</th>
<th>Scope Revisions Increase (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>$37.8</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
<td>$20.5</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$25.7</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>$57.4</td>
<td>$90.1</td>
<td>$32.7</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Related Overhead</td>
<td>- $24.2</td>
<td>$24.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>$93.5</td>
<td>$115.0</td>
<td>$21.5</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Support</td>
<td>$92.5</td>
<td>$101.2</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Capital</td>
<td>$205.5</td>
<td>$205.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$470.6</td>
<td>$599.5</td>
<td>$128.9</td>
<td>$85.7</td>
<td>$43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 2004 Value Analysis Study mitigated rising Right of Way Capital costs.
SR 52 New Freeway Segment
Management of Project’s Cost Increase

- Cost Reduction Strategies

- Project Options
  (Options A and B)

SR 52 New Freeway Segment
Cost Reduction Strategies

- Independent Cost/Risk Studies

- Coordinate with Regional Projects to locate sources of excess dirt for SR 52

- Delete project features
  - Changeable Message Signs
  - Architectural Treatments
  - Fiber Optic elements

- Refine project design elements
SR 52 New Freeway Segment

OPTION A
Cost: $599.5 M

OPTION B
Cost: $496 M
SR 52 New Freeway Segment Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Completes TransNet Tier 1 project</td>
<td>• Project Cost Overrun. Cost Overrun funded from SR 52 Managed Lanes construction phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removes regional traffic from Santee City Streets</td>
<td>• SR 52 Managed Lanes construction deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completes construction by 2010</td>
<td>• SR 52/SR67 Interchange deferred (possibly 20 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructs the project close to the budgeted amount</td>
<td>• SR 52 between Cuyamaca and Magnolia delayed 1 to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts to local traffic patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTION A
$599.5 M

OPTION B
$496 M

SR 52 New Freeway Segment Option A Proposed Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Project</th>
<th>Current CIP Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Proposed CIP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Extension (CIP 1205203)</td>
<td>$470.6 M</td>
<td>+ $128.9 M</td>
<td>$599.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Managed Lanes (CIP 1205201)</td>
<td>$191.2 M</td>
<td>- $128.9 M</td>
<td>$62.3 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR 52 Managed Lanes Proposed Budget will fund ED/PR work estimated at $11 M.
SR 52 New Freeway Segment
Action Requested

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Option A for the completion of the SR 52 Freeway Extension project and the completion of the environmental phase of SR 52 Managed Lanes project.