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• DRAFT 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
• LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT
• TransNet SENIOR TRANSPORTATION MINI-GRANT PROGRAM

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

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

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

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

**SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.**
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1. MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE JUNE 20, 2007 ITOC MEETING</td>
<td>ACCEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary of the June 20, 2007 ITOC meeting has been prepared for the Committee’s review and approval.</td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the ITOC on any issue within the jurisdiction of the ITOC. Speakers will be limited to three minutes each. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 9:35 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ANNUAL ELECTION OF ITOC CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per the ITOC bylaws, at the July meeting of each year elections are to be held for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions for the new fiscal year.</td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 9:40 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4. MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT: PURSUIT OF FEDERAL VERY SMALL STARTS FUNDING (Dave Schumacher)</td>
<td>REVIEW AND COMMENT/SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mid-City Rapid Bus project, which was one of the major corridor projects included in the TransNet Extension, would implement capital improvements aimed at providing a high-speed, limited-stop service between San Diego State University and Downtown via the El Cajon Boulevard corridor. The project would include transit signal priority, upgraded stations, next bus technology, and new vehicles. Staff will review the funding strategy for this project, which is based on pursuit of federal capital discretionary funding under the new federal Very Small Starts Funding program to provide a 50% match for the project. ITOC comments regarding moving forward with this strategy will be provided to the SANDAG Transportation Committee on July 20th and the Board of Directors on July 27th.</td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 9:50 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5. DRAFT 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (Mike Hix)</td>
<td>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At its June 22nd meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan for distribution for public comment purposes. Staff will present an overview of the draft plan and its relationship to the TransNet program.</td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 10:10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6.</td>
<td>LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT (Stephan Vance/Susan Carter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the time the ITOC supported the request for additional TransNet funding to support completion of the bicycle bridge over Lake Hodges, a request was made to have quarterly reports on the implementation of the project similar to the progress reports being received for the North County Transit District SPRINTER project. This is the first of these quarterly reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>TransNet EXTENSION SENIOR TRANSPORTATION MINI-GRANT PROGRAM (Dan Levy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REVIEW AND COMMENT/SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 11:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will present recommended eligibility criteria, program rules, procedures, sample application forms and related materials for the implementation of the new senior transportation grant program included in the TransNet Extension. The intent is to initiate the first cycle of the program in Fiscal Year 2007-08 so that the projects can be selected and ready to be implemented when the new program funding commences in Fiscal Year 2008-09 – or July 1, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>DRAFT ITOC ANNUAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006-07 (Craig Scott/Joy De Korte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REVIEW AND COMMENT/DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 12:45 p.m. or following the lunch break whichever is earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on a review of agenda items and major actions over the past year, SANDAG staff has prepared an initial draft of an annual report for the ITOC’s review. The draft will be distributed at the meeting. The purpose of this item is to initiate discussion on the draft annual report, with the intent of having a final draft available for action at the September meeting. A presentation of the annual report would then be scheduled for the SANDAG Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9.</td>
<td>UPDATE ON THE TransNet PLAN OF FINANCE PROCESS (Richard Chavez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 1:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will provide the ITOC with an update on the Plan of Finance process. As requested at the last ITOC meeting, today’s discussion will focus on the current cost estimates for the TransNet major corridor projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (Jim Linthicum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Start Time: 1:40 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item provides a monthly status report on the SPRINTER rail project, including discussion of implementation and effectiveness of project cost control measures and the SANDAG independent assessment of the project. Due to staff vacation schedules, this item will be a verbal report this month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ITEM #**

11. **FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE**

The dates shown below have been suggested as potential meeting dates. The meetings are proposed to be scheduled from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The next meeting date and time will be confirmed at the end of each meeting. The ITOC may wish to suggest specific agenda topics for the next meeting. Potential topics for the next meeting include: ongoing discussions of major corridor projects, review of the final draft ITOC annual report for FY 2006-07, and preliminary results of the TransNet Plan of Finance update process.

Scheduled Future Meeting Dates:

- August 15, 2007 (if needed)
- September 19, 2007
- October 17, 2007
- November 21, 2007
- December 19, 2007 (if needed)

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

**RECOMMENDATION**

**ACTION**

Estimated Start Time:

2:10 p.m.
MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE JUNE 20, 2007
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (ITOC) MEETING

June 20, 2007 Meeting Summary

Attendance–
Committee Members:  Maryam Babaki  Kevin Cummins
                    Ron Gerow  Valerie Harrison  John Meyer
Ex-Officio Members:
Others:  Cory Binns, Caltrans, District 11
         Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans, District 11
         Harvey Goodfriend, San Diego County
         Taxpayers Association
         Joel Haven, Caltrans, District 11
         Allan Kosup, Caltrans, District 11
         Fred Luedtke, City of Escondido
         Mark Phelan, Caltrans, District 11
         Carl Savage, Caltrans, District 11
         Bill Valle, Caltrans District 11
         Rob Zaino, City of Escondido
         Susan Brown, SANDAG
         Richard Chavez, SANDAG
         Keith Greer, SANDAG
         Sookyung Kim, SANDAG
         Jim Linthicum, SANDAG
         Jose Nuncio, SANDAG
         Craig Scott, SANDAG
         Derek Toups, SANDAG
         Stephan Vance, SANDAG

The following summarizes the major actions and key discussion points under each agenda item from the June 20, 2007 meeting.

Item 1 - Meeting Summary for the May 16, 2007 ITOC Meeting

The meeting summary of the May 16, 2007 regular ITOC meeting was approved as written. John Meyer requested that when meetings are held outside of the SANDAG offices in the future, the meeting summaries should more prominently reflect the location of the meeting. Kevin Cummins requested that a preliminary draft of the meeting summaries be distributed to members via e-mail within a week following the meeting.

Item 2 - Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

No public comments were received. Craig Scott announced that former ITOC members Jim Callaghan and Doug Gibson would be receiving recognition for their two years of service at the
SANDAG Board meeting on Friday, June 22nd. Members also were reminded that the annual election of ITOC officers would be scheduled for the July meeting.

Chair Maryam Babaki informed the committee that she had accepted a new position as City Engineer for the City of National City beginning in early July, so this would be her last meeting. John Meyer expressed his appreciation for Maryam's efforts and her willingness to step in and keep the committee on track after the first chair of the ITOC resigned. The members congratulated Maryam on her new position and thanked her for her service as Chair of the committee. There was discussion of the replacement process and the timeline for selecting a new member. Craig Scott indicated that the staff would be initiating a new recruitment process and that it was unlikely that a new member could be in place until at least the September meeting.

**Item 3 - I-15 Managed Lanes: North Segment Operational Issues**

Gustavo Dallarda provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 1) including more details on the design for the I-15 North segment in response to questions raised at the last meeting by Hamid Bahadori and others. Members expressed concern that Hamid was not able to attend the meeting and suggested that he may want to talk to Gustavo separately if he had additional concerns.

Gustavo reviewed the design of the North segment and explained why the buffer design was selected in this section of the I-15 Managed Lanes project, while a barrier system is being implemented in the South and Middle segments. He explained the challenges of adding a barrier on the North segment. The additional right-of-way required for a barrier would require new environmental studies, additional right-of-way acquisition, and widening of 11 bridges over the freeway. He reviewed several examples of the impacts to the bridges in this area. He estimated the cost of these changes at a minimum of $50 million, not including the additional escalation costs of the overall project due to time delay. Gustavo also reviewed the experience on the State Route (SR) 91 project in terms of the use of delineators. He explained how the delineators are routinely run over by motorists, requiring Caltrans maintenance crews to go out every three weeks to replace them and creating a significant ongoing expense. He went on to review how the tolling and enforcement strategy will be implemented. He explained that the project has been designed consistent with statewide standards for such facilities. He also committed that Caltrans will be closely monitoring the area once it is opened and that if delineators or other technology improvements are required based on actual experience, then additional changes will be made. He introduced Cory Binns, the Caltrans design manager for the project, and Derek Toups from SANDAG, who is coordinating the toll operations component for the project and indicated they were available to help answer questions.

John Meyer reiterated the concerns raised at the last meeting by Hamid Bahadori regarding the FasTrak® operations and enforcement. The concern related to traffic safety in that drivers may swerve in and out of the managed lanes to avoid being charged a toll since there is only a painted separation in this segment and not a barrier. John also raised a concern about adequate signage to let northbound motorists know that they are transitioning from a barrier system to buffer only section as they move from the Middle to the North segment. Gustavo said he would look into the possibility of additional signage, but stressed that the buffer is the standard state design treatment and that the transition would be very similar to the existing situation where the barrier-separated, reversible lanes transition into the regular lanes.

Valerie Harrison stated that Gustavo had provided a good explanation of the challenges associated with changing to a barrier approach, but that she was interested in what the additional benefits of the barrier would be. Maryam Babaki stated that the members understood that it is too late to go
back and add the barrier at this late date, but wanted to know what could be done to mitigate some of the concerns that had been raised. Gustavo indicated that enforcement will be key and described the enhanced level of enforcement that is planned for this facility to be funded out of the FasTrak® revenues. Ron Gerow agreed that aggressive enforcement could be very effective in dealing with the potential problems that had been raised.

**Item 4 - SPRINTERS Project Status Report and SANDAG Independent Assessment**

Jim Linthicum reviewed the information included in the agenda package and provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 2) summarizing the status of the SPRINTERS project. He reported that progress continues on the project, with the vehicle maintenance facility being fully occupied, the San Marcos loop portion of the line is now complete except for an elevator and landscaping, and the fiber optic network has been completed. Track and station work continues, with the critical work item being the ongoing work on communications systems. The contractor is preparing a new detailed baseline schedule for all remaining items; however, the December 2007 completion date is still expected to be achievable.

He also reported that the updated cost-to-complete estimate was just over $460 million, as compared to the $448.9 million last month. The cost estimate is still well below the $484.2 million approved as part of the Recovery Plan. Jim explained that the reason for the increase was the approval of a $12.2 million settlement to resolve outstanding claims on the project. He explained some of the details of the settlement agreement and expressed his opinion that the agreement represents a good deal in that it resolves several difficult issues and avoids ongoing legal costs. Jim highlighted remaining concerns related to potential overruns of construction quantities and change orders where price has not yet been negotiated. He felt that once the new baseline schedule and updated cost estimates are completed for all remaining work items, the confidence level for both the cost and schedule to complete the project would be greatly enhanced.

For the benefit of the new ITOC members, John Meyer provided some background regarding the ITOC’s involvement in the SPRINTERS project over the past year. He expressed satisfaction with the settlement agreement as a good way of resolving the remaining “soft” area in the project budget. Kevin Cummins inquired about how the claim review process outlined in the settlement agreement will actually work. Jim explained that the $12.2 million is a “not-to-exceed” figure and reviewed a typical process for how each claim item would be reviewed and approved. Members also discussed the likelihood of North County Transit District (NCTD) recovering damages for design flaws in the project.

**Item 5 - 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Amendment No. 6**

Sookyung Kim provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 3) covering an overview of the RTIP process and how the TransNet program fits into that process. The overview covered the basis for the RTIP process in state and federal law, the types of projects that are required to be included in the RTIP, the requirement in the TransNet Ordinance for sales tax-funded projects to be included in the RTIP, and the ITOC’s role in reviewing the proposed programming of TransNet dollars in the RTIP. She also reviewed the process for amending the RTIP and the overall timeline for the entire RTIP programming process.

In addition to the RTIP overview, Sookyung reviewed materials included in the agenda package in terms of the specific proposed changes for the current amendment to the RTIP. She summarized the reasons for the proposed changes to TransNet-funded projects and drew the ITOC’s attention to the
attached summary tables and graphs showing the local street and road formula fund balances for each local jurisdiction requesting additional fund programming for local projects, as well as an analysis of the “70/30” requirement for the ITOC’s review. Stephan Vance described the proposed amendment for the Bayshore Bikeway project and reviewed a handout with updated figures for this project. The basic proposal is to exchange TransNet funds for federal funds currently programmed to the bikeway project in order to free the project from federal procedural requirements and allow the bikeway project to be delivered more quickly.

Members asked some specific questions regarding projects included in the agenda package. A request also was made for the staff to continue to work on displaying more of the information in charts and graphs to assist the ITOC in its review of future ITOC amendments. No specific comments were raised on any of the proposed programming changes to be carried forward to the Transportation Committee when it considers the amendment.

**Item 6 - TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Overview and Status Report**

Keith Greer provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 4) as an overview of the new EMP. He started with a review of habitat planning in the region, described the status of the various habitat plans covering the region, and explained how the TransNet Ordinance established the new EMP program to address project mitigation requirements and to assist in the implementation of the region’s habitat plans. The concept was to move away from traditional project-by-project mitigation to a more flexible concept employing large-scale mitigation banks and other mechanisms to accelerate the acquisition of critical habitat areas and facilitating the future implementation of transportation improvements. He reviewed how the funding in the TransNet program is to be broken down between project mitigation and more flexible habitat conservation funds, as known as “economic benefit” funds. He discussed the status of negotiations that have been ongoing for a number of months between SANDAG, Caltrans, and the environmental resource agencies on an agreement that is needed to move forward with the implementation of the EMP. Keith summarized some of the difficult issues to be resolved related to obtaining satisfactory assurances that advanced expenditures for habitat-related activities will result in mitigation for projects to be delivered in the future.

John Meyer expressed a desire to reach agreement on mitigation requirements on a regionwide basis instead of having to wait for completion of project-specific agreements. Harvey Goodfriend from the Taxpayers Association expressed concern that the whole idea behind the EMP program in the TransNet Ordinance was to create large mitigation banks and accelerate the mitigation process for major transportation projects and that the process outlined for implementing the EMP was taking too long. Keith agreed that that was the intent of the new program, but that SANDAG needs to obtain legally-binding assurances that EMP funding spent early will in fact mitigate projects later.

Maryam Babaki liked the basic concept of the EMP program, but agreed that “the devil is in the details” and that the agreements need to be worked out appropriately. She asked about the schedule for completing the agreements. Kevin Cummins felt that this program should be viewed as a “win-win” approach and that the resource agencies should be happy to see a significant amount of funding released upfront. He asked to see a breakdown of the EMP funding, including what activities would be funded in the early years of the program. Keith explained the process to take place over the next few months to finalize the agreement. He indicated that the approval of the agreement will result in certain cash flow requirements for the EMP that will need to be reflected in the Plan of Finance. The ITOC will have an opportunity to review those proposed expenditures through its role in reviewing the Plan of Finance this fall.
Item 7 - State Route (SR) 76 Corridor Update

Allan Kosup reviewed the material included the agenda report and provided a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 5) covering the status of the SR 76 corridor. He described the status of the two major segments of the project – the Middle segment from Melrose Avenue to Mission Road and the East segment from Mission Road to I-15 – as well as the environmental enhancement component of the project. He focused his presentation on the updated cost estimates, which show a $92 million cost increase on the Middle segment and a $51 million cost increase on the East segment. He explained that a budget increase is not being requested at this time since efforts are still underway on cost reduction strategies. He reviewed a table which provided a detailed breakdown of the costs for the Middle segment, comparing the changes in the cost estimates by major project component and identifying changes driven by increases in quantities versus changes driven by increases in unit prices. For components where the changes were due to increasing quantities, Allan explained the major reasons for scope changes or additional project features that have been factored into the project cost estimate, such as additional wildlife crossings, the need for a separate bridge structure not included in the initial estimate, additional earthwork due to a shift in the alignment to avoid a Native American resource site, and the addition of bio-swales along the edge of the roadway to address new water quality requirements. Several cost reduction strategies and alternative funding sources are being investigated to help reduce the overall need for additional TransNet funding. Allan also provided a review of actual expenditures compared to budgeted levels for environmental, design, and right-of-way activities. He explained that the environmental mitigation effort has been accelerated in advance of the completion of the environmental document, with two parcels in escrow and another in active negotiation with a willing seller.

John Meyer reiterated his concern about the timeline for completing SR 76 and asked if anything could be done to accelerate the completion of the East segment. Allan said that there could be some opportunities to move the schedule up. Kevin Cummins asked for clarification on some of the environmental issues on the project and the definition being used for net environmental benefit. Craig Scott explained that the Ordinance language was fairly general regarding net benefit because the design solution could vary from project to project; however, the basic intent was that for SR 76, SR 67, and SR 94, the new facility should be better for the environment than the existing roadway. The SR 76 project is being used to refine how that language is to be interpreted. Kevin was concerned that a more precise definition is needed to avoid future challenges to the project that could cause additional delay. Kevin also asked what the projections show in terms of how long a four-lane facility will handle the demand for the corridor. Allan responded that the four-lane facility, with the median barriers and other improvements being added and the higher design speed, should be adequate to meet projected demand until about 2030.

Item 8 - Future Meeting Schedule

The next regular meeting of the ITOC was scheduled for July 18, 2007, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at SANDAG. Potential agenda items for the meeting included ongoing discussions of the status of the major corridor projects, a report on the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, and an update on the Plan of Finance process. It was suggested that members be contacted regarding their availability for July since there could be a quorum issue.

Item 9 - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.
I-15 MANAGED LANES

North Segment Operational Strategy

TransNet

June 20, 2007

Presentation Outline

- Barrier Separation vs. Buffer Separation
- Maintenance
- Tolling Strategy
- Enforcement Strategy
Barrier Separation

vs.

Buffer Separation

Managed Lanes

North Segment

4 miles - Buffer Separated

Middle and South Segments

16 miles - Barrier Separated
Buffer vs. Barrier Separation

25.8 m wide

33.6 m wide

7.8 m difference

Buffer Separation:

- Minimizes environmental footprint
- Avoids environmentally sensitive habitat
- Minimizes bridge widening
- Avoids vertical clearance problems at local streets
- Minimizes traffic impacts to community
- Avoid purchasing additional right of way
- Cost effective
Barrier Separation:

- Would impact environmentally sensitive habitat
- Would require additional widening at 11 bridges
- Would create vertical clearance problems at Centre City Pkwy., Felicita Rd., 9th Ave, Hale Ave., and Valley Pkwy.
- Would require lowering all of these streets (and underground utilities)
- Would require additional retaining walls
- Would require additional right of way
- Would delay the project/ Increased capital and support costs
9th Ave

Buffer Separated

9th Ave to Valley Pkwy.

Buffer Separated
Maintenance

State Route 91
Buffer Separation w/ Delineators
SR-91 Experience:

- SR-91 has only one tolling/enforcement point, North Segment has 2 each direction
- Delineators on SR-91 get hit and need to be replaced by shutting down the facility every three weeks
- Delineators on SR-91 have not solved the violation issue and OCTA is looking at alternative enforcement solutions
- Will continue monitoring North Segment after opening day and re-evaluate need for delineators and other technologies in the future

Tolling Strategy
Managed Lanes Pricing Principles

- **Per-Mile Tolling**
  - Patrons charged on a per-mile basis
  - Fare = per-mile rate * distance traveled in Managed Lanes

- **Dynamic Tolling**
  - Per-mile rate will vary by Level of Service (LOS) on the ML and Travel Time Saving
  - Goal: Maintain 60mph on ML at all times

- **Skewed Tolling**
  - Per-mile rate will vary by location
  - The closer the entry point lies to areas of congestion, the higher the per-mile rate

- **Travel Time Savings**
  - The greater the time savings offered by the Managed Lanes, the greater the fare

Managed Lanes Signage

- Appropriate signage will guide users to Managed Lanes entry and exit locations

- Static signs provide directional information and turn movement warning

- Variable Toll Message Signs (VTMS) provide current toll rate and offer the possibility for value-added content such as travel times to nearest destination
**Tolling System**

- VTMS
- Tolling Location with VES
- Tolling Location

Typical Entry Sign from General Purpose Lanes

---

**Buffer Separation - Weave Access**

Oblique view showing typical weaving location for intermediate access
Enforcement Strategy

Managed Lanes Enforcement

- Routine enforcement of Managed Lanes by CHP
- Potential use of automated enforcement cameras
  - Use of transponders for HOV and SOV may be required
- Other potential technologies to aid CHP in enforcement:
  - Mobile enforcement transponder readers
  - Mobile data terminals with central computer lookup
  - Transaction status lights
Photo Enforcement

Enforcement of North Segment

- Violators may be photographed (license plate)

- Vehicles that fail to register entry and exit locations (either from transponder or image) will be charged the maximum fare

- CHP routine enforcement will serve as a deterrent to violating ($351 minimum fine)

- Additional processing of those caught violating via cameras
Summary:

- Changing to Barrier Separation:
  - Environmental impacts (bio, noise, local traffic)
  - Additional right of way impacts (utilities, acquisition)
  - Would delay the project
  - Increased capital and support costs
- Buffer separation without delineators is a standard design
- Delineators could be added in the future
- Tolling and enforcement strategies will deter violators

Questions?
Current Progress

- Vehicle Maintenance Facility: occupied
- San Marcos Loop: complete except for the elevator and landscaping
- Fiber Optic Network: complete
- Track & Stations: ongoing
- Communication systems (critical work): ongoing
Settlement Agreement: Main Line Contract

- Abnormally high number of changes
- Exposure to delay, disruption, inefficiency, & overhead claims (impact damages)
- Contractor due additional time for changes pushing completion date into next spring

Settlement Agreement: Main Line Contract

- Impact Damages:
  - Not to exceed $12.2 million
  - Supporting documentation required
  - Disputes over documentation goes to binding arbitration
Settlement Agreement: Main Line Contract

• **Additional time (acceleration)**
  – Contractor gives up his rights to additional time due to changes
  – Contractor re-sequences & accelerates work
  – New internal milestones
  – Milestone payments: up to $3.3 million
  – Amount based on project support costs
  – Liquidated Damages: up to $20,000/day

Settlement Agreement: Main Line Contract

• **Staff Analysis: Impact damages**
  – Resolves difficult to defend claims
  – Avoids legal fees
  – Contractor must provide supporting documentation
  – Balanced & in the best interest of NCTD
Settlement Agreement: Main Line Contract

- **Staff Analysis: Acceleration**
  - Internal milestones support early completion
  - Payments based on NCTD’s overhead savings
  - Liquidated damages protect NCTD in case milestones are not achieved
  - Balanced & in the best interest of NCTD

- **Summary:** affords NCTD much greater confidence level with both cost and schedule

---

Estimate at Completion (EAC)

- **EAC workshop:** May 29th
- Reviewed assumptions made in the amended recovery plan for contingency & final quantities
- Reviewed future costs for
  - construction management
  - design
  - insurance
  - environmental mitigation
  - local agency oversight
  - storm water protection
Estimate at Completion (EAC)

- Tentative EAC: $460 million
- Includes maximum value of settlement agreement
- Excludes adjustments for CM, design, insurance, etc.
- Excludes settlement with the City of Vista
- Amended Recovery Plan budget: $484.1M

Estimate at Completion (EAC)

- Future risks to cost:
  - Potential overrun of construction quantities
  - Change order work where price has not been negotiated
  - NCTD will dedicate estimating resources to project these costs
Project Concerns

- EAC will not be accurate until adjustments are made and final quantities of significant items of work are calculated.
- Revenue Operations Date: new baseline schedule from contractor pending.
2006 Regional Transportation Program (RTIP)

What is the RTIP?

- Regional Transportation Improvement Program
- Short-term document that implements the RTP
  - Projects in the next five years
- Conform to air quality
Why?

Federal Law

- Title 23 USC Sec. 134(h) – developed every two years by the MPO's
- Title 42 USC Sec. 7506 – conform to State Air Quality Plan
Types of Projects in RTIP

- Projects with federal or state transportation funds
- TransNet funds
- Regionally significant
- Capacity increasing projects

Role of ITOC

- Review and comment on the programming of TransNet revenues in the RTIP
- Raise concerns related to eligibility, cost increases, and changes to scope for major corridor projects
- Provide comments to the SANDAG TC and Board
TransNet Program of Projects (POP)

The 5-year period covered by the 2006 RTIP reflects the last two years of the current TransNet program (FY 2007 and 2008) and the first three years of the TransNet Extension (FYs 2009, 2010, & 2011)

ITOC and TransNet POP (contin.)

Review and comment on:
- Local projects proposed for funding identified as congestion relief – 70%
- for operations and maintenance - 30%
- Local environmental mitigation
- Major corridor projects
- Transit funding
Amendments

During its 2-year cycle, necessary to amend the RTIP

There are two types:
• Formal
• Administrative

Formal Amendments

• Requires 30-day public review period
• Transportation Committee approval
• State (Caltrans) and federal (FTA/FHWA) approval
• 4 months
Administrative Amendments

Administrative

- No need for separate public review
- TC approval
- Only need Caltrans approval
- 1 to 2 months

Programming Cycle
- New 2006 RTIP web page
- www.sandag.org\2006RTIP
Environmental Mitigation Program

Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act (1991)
Habitat Preservation Planning Areas in the San Diego Region

Regional Habitat Preserve Planning Area

- Habitat Preserve Planning Area
- Natural Habitats
- Developed, Disturbed, and Agricultural Land
The intent is to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans. (Section D)
The program benefits transportation mitigation requirements by:

- Creating a reliable approach to fund required mitigation for future transportation improvements
- Reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery
- Obtaining assurances for transportation projects through agreements based on habitat conservation plans

S.D. Housing Market Growth over 26 Years

Source: Real Estate Research Council of Southern California and DataQuick
TransNet Extension

40 Year Expenditure Plan
(In Billions, 2002 Dollars)

- Major Highway & Transit Projects (47) $4.65
- Local Streets & Roads $3.95
- Transit Services $2.24
- New BRT/Rail Operations $1.1
- Administration $0.14
- Bike & Pedestrian $0.28
- Smart Growth $0.28
- Oversight Committee (Not shown) $0.01
- Environmental Mitigation $0.8
- Environmental Mitigation Local $0.25
- Financing Cost $0.5

Total Program $14 Billion

Environmental Mitigation Program Costs
(In Millions, 2002 Dollars)

- Transportation Project Mitigation Fund $650m
- Major Highway & Transit Project Mitigation $450
- Local Transportation Project Mitigation $200
- Regional Habitat Conservation Fund $200m
- $50
- $150
- $50

Total Program $850 Million

Plus up to $30m in financing costs For advanced habitat acquisition
“Economic Benefit” based on:

- Agreements with the Wildlife Agencies to link mitigation needs, conservation opportunities and available funding,
- Assuring mitigation requirements in advance of project need, and
- Purchasing mitigation land in advance of need in larger blocks at a lower cost

EMP Working Group

- SANDAG
- County and Cities
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Coastal Conservancy
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- Building Industry and Environmental Community
EMP Decision Making Process

SANDAG Board of Directors

Transportation Committee
(Transportation Project Mitigation Fund)

Regional Planning Committee with EMP Advisory Members
(Regional Habitat Conservation Fund)

EMP Working Group

What’s Next?

- Complete MOA on EMP
- Develop Conservation and Mitigation Strategy
- Work on Specific Project Agreements
- Implement 5-year Management and Monitoring Strategy
The program benefits conservation implementation activities by providing funds for:

- Large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas
- Habitat acquisition, land management, and habitat restoration as required in the conservation programs
- A regional biological database to centralize data used to monitor the health of the ecosystem and the species protected by the preserve
Early Action Projects

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

**Tier 2 Projects**
4. I-15 Managed Lanes/BRT
5. SR 52 - HOV/Managed Lanes (Reversible)
6. I-5 North Coast Corridor - Environmental Effort
7. I-805 Corridor/South Bay BRT - Environmental Effort
SR 76 CORRIDOR Project Update

TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee Presentation
Agenda Item
June 20, 2007

SR 76 Corridor
Middle Segment *(Melrose to Mission)*
East Segment *(Mission to I-15)*
Mitigation and Enhancements *(Corridor - wide)*

[Map of SR 76 Corridor showing Middle and East segments]
SR-76 “Middle”

Scope
- Melrose to S. Mission Road
- 4-lane highway
- At-grade intersections
- Context Sensitive Design

Schedule
- Draft ED Summer 2007
- R/W acquisition underway
- Construction begins early 2009
- Complete construction late 2011

Budget
- 2005 Estimate - $158 million
- 2008 Estimate - $250 million
- $92 million shortfall

SR 76 Typical Roadway

4-lane Conventional Highway with median barrier

Bio-Swale
**SR 76 Typical Roadway**

Visual Simulation of Existing Roadway
Looking Easterly across new San Luis Rey River Bridge
With existing structure pictured at left

---

**SR-76 “East”**

**Scope**
- S. Mission Road to I-15
- 4-lane highway
- At-grade intersections
- Context Sensitive Design

**Schedule**
- Final ED late 2009
- Prelim Engineering and environmental technical studies underway
- Construction begins late 2011
- Complete construction late 2014

**Budget**
- 2005 Estimate - $242 million
- 2009 Estimate - $293 million
- $51 million shortfall
SR-76 Corridor Enhancement and Mitigation

**Scope**
- Acquisition of Mitigation parcels
- Acquisition of “net benefit” parcels

**Schedule**
- Underway - offers made to owners
- Other properties being studied
- Ongoing effort

**Budget**
- 2005 Estimate - $83.0 million
- 2007 Estimate - $83.0 million

---

Caltrans Construction Index

TransNet Ordinance Cost Estimates Established

Doubling every 5 years
Doubling every 20 years
Doubling every 4 years
**SR-76 Middle Cost Increases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005 Quantity</th>
<th>2007 Quantity</th>
<th>2005 Unit Price*</th>
<th>2007 Unit Price*</th>
<th>2005 Cost (1,000's)</th>
<th>2007 Cost (1,000's)</th>
<th>Increase (1,000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures</strong></td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthwork</strong></td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>21,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Concrete</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>117,500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Section</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Slope Protection</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Furnished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Related Overhead</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Items**
- $82,500
- $144,900
- $62,400

**Right-Of-Way**
- $41,000
- $64,000
- $23,000

**TOTAL CAPITAL COST**
- $123,500
- $208,900
- $85,400

**Support Costs**
- $34,000
- $41,500
- $7,500

**Total Project**
- $157,500
- $250,400
- $92,900

---

**SR-76 “Middle” Trend Curves**

**SR-76 MIDDLE ENVIRONMENTAL**
Cululative Expenditures & Budget

![Graph showing the cumulative expenditures and budget for SR-76 “Middle” Trend Curves from 6/2001 to 10/2008.](image-url)
SR 76 Corridor Cost Reduction and Funding Strategies

- Independent Cost/Risk Analysis complete April 2007
- Initial cost reduction strategy saves $6-9 million
  - Reduced roadway prism
  - Steeper cut slopes, minimizing earthwork, reducing R/W
  - Reconfigured construction staging
- Additional strategies targeting $20-30 million in savings
  - On site disposal of excess materials
  - Incorporation of onsite materials into roadway prism
  - Donations of required R/W from other agencies
- Identification of other fund sources
  - TIF Funds
  - Development contributions/mitigations

SR 76 Corridor Schedule Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Action</th>
<th>76 Middle Baseline Schedule</th>
<th>76 Middle Current Schedule</th>
<th>76 East Baseline Schedule</th>
<th>76 Mit/Enhancement Baseline Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Construction</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Schedule Risks
  - Input from external stakeholders
  - Right of Way condemnation
  - Construction windows

- Acceleration Strategies
  - Early Right of Way acquisition
  - Innovative Bidding strategies
  - Early Utility Relocation
  - Acceleration of Long lead items (geotechnical work, etc.)
MID-CITY RAPID BUS PROJECT: PURSUIT OF FEDERAL VERY SMALL STARTS FUNDING

Introduction

The Mid-City Rapid Bus project includes the design and implementation of a ten-mile high-speed, limited-stop service between San Diego State University (SDSU) and downtown San Diego along El Cajon and Park Boulevards. The line will provide North Park, City Heights, and College area residents, students, and workers with a limited-stop, high-speed service in one of the key transit corridors in the region. Major activity centers that will be served by the route include downtown, Balboa Park/San Diego Zoo, the Mid-City communities, and SDSU (see Attachment 1 map).

The Rapid Bus project represents the initial step toward implementing a full Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service in this corridor, as envisioned by the Regional Transportation Plan. The Mid-City BRT project also is one of the major corridor projects included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan approved by the voters in 2004. Rapid Bus services are designed to provide higher-speed alternatives to local bus services in key arterial corridors utilizing a range of lower capital cost signal priority treatments and limited station spacing to achieve faster travel times. Rapid Bus services can be upgraded to BRT over time through use of dedicated transit lanes to bypass congested arterial segments.

Advanced planning and conceptual engineering work for the middle segment of the project between Park Boulevard/University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard/College Avenue) have been completed. This includes development of a signal priority treatment plan, station designs, street improvements and a small segment of transit-only lanes. We have focused our attention on the middle segment of the route because the downtown improvements are being folded into a long-range transit plan for downtown that will address the multiple routes that serve downtown. The eastern segment occurs within a constrained right-of-way which makes it difficult to provide bus-only turn pockets and enhanced shelters. The middle segment provides the best opportunity to implement signal priority, bus-only queue jump lanes, station upgrades, and to achieve significant transit travel time savings.

This item outlines the benefits that would accrue from the project and discusses a recent opportunity that has arisen to apply for funding under a new federal program designed for small-scale capital improvements projects.
Discussion

Project Benefits

The project would benefit both existing transit riders and serve to attract new riders by transforming existing Route 15 (one of the Metropolitan Transit System’s (MTS) most productive routes) into a Rapid Bus service characterized by faster travel times, enhanced customer experience, and more frequent service. Specific improvements include:

- **Faster Travel Times**: The key focus of the project is improving transit travel times along the corridor for both local bus service (MTS Route 1) and the proposed Route 15 Rapid Bus service. Because the project is focused on improvements throughout the length of El Cajon Boulevard, it will be especially attractive to passengers making longer distance trips. Improved travel times will be achieved by consolidating transit stops, pre-paid fares, coordinated signal timing, extended green signal phases for buses, and level boarding.

- **Enhanced Customer Experience**: The customer experience will be improved through creation of transit stations with distinctive shelters branded for the Rapid Bus service, “next vehicle” information, and new articulated vehicles branded with a distinctive Rapid Bus theme. The project will also improve the pedestrian environment and safety in and around station areas through better crosswalks and hardscape/landscape enhancements.

- **Frequent Service**: Service frequency will be upgraded on the Rapid Bus service to operate every 10 minutes in the peak period and every 15 minutes in the off-peak.

The Mid-City Rapid Bus project has been received positively by the Mid-City community groups, who especially support the proposed frequency enhancements, travel time savings, and improvements to the public right-of-way. The route runs through several of San Diego’s older, densely developed urban communities that are identified as Smart Growth areas in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. New development continues to occur along the route, with an emphasis on residential in-fill and walkability. In addition, El Cajon Boulevard has been enhanced with landscaped medians to improve its image and appeal. The Mid-City Rapid Bus project will continue this trend and help support the continued revitalization of El Cajon Boulevard.

The project is ready to move into the preliminary/final design stages and could be implemented by 2010 if we are successful in securing Very Small Starts funding. Preliminary discussions with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (see discussion below) have been very productive, with FTA officials expressing support for SANDAG’s submittal of an application for capital funding for the project.

Federal Funding Opportunity

The FTA administers the Section 5309 Capital Investment Grants program, which provides capital funds for major transit investment projects. The program was recently amended to add a new project category called “Very Small Starts” to provide funding for simple, low-risk projects. The Very Small Starts application process has been simplified, and funds are available on a competitive basis. The Very Small Starts criteria, along with a brief discussion on how the Mid-City BRT project meets each one, are listed below:

- Substantial transit stations (Mid-City project would create rail-like stations with branded shelters, next vehicle information, and hardscape/landscape features)
- Traffic signal priority (Mid-City project would have corridorwide signal priority treatments and queue jump lanes)
- Low-floor vehicles or level boarding (Mid-City project includes new articulated buses would be low-floor, and station platforms would allow for level boarding)
- Branding (Mid-City project would include unique branding of both stations and vehicles to provide high visibility for the Rapid Bus service)
- 10-minute peak/15-minute off-peak service (Mid-City project would enhance current service to these frequencies—funding for this service improvement is included in TransNet)
- Existing ridership exceeds 3,000 (ridership in the corridor on Route 15 meets this requirement)
- Total capital cost less than $50 million (Mid-City project budget is $40 million—see discussion below)

We are currently finalizing the capital cost budget for the project and assembling the Very Small Starts application materials. The current budget estimate for the capital improvements in the middle segment is just under $40 million, which includes purchase of 15 articulated buses. (Funding for the Balboa Park, Downtown, and SDSU segments of the project, along with transit-only lanes to upgrade the project to a BRT service, would be part of a longer-term plan.)

In terms of federal funding, we will be requesting a 50 percent funding match ($20 million) from the FTA, with the local share coming from TransNet funding identified for the project. The 50 percent match is used because FTA has indicated that projects with firm funding commitments from the local agency and using with the 50 percent federal match will likely receive a “highly rated” designation.

Since the announcement of the Very Small Starts program, we have had extensive discussions with FTA staff about the potential of receiving federal funding for the Mid-City Rapid Bus project. Based on these discussions, FTA staff has indicated their strong interest in the project and is actively encouraging us to submit a Very Small Starts application. Because the program is still new, the FTA is looking for good projects to fund and see the Mid-City Rapid Bus project as a good candidate. Furthermore, they suggested we apply by September 15, 2007, which would make us eligible for inclusion in the FY 09 Federal Record that serves as the basis for gaining federal discretionary funding.

**Next Steps**

With the FTA actively encouraging SANDAG to apply for Very Small Starts funding, we have a unique opportunity to leverage federal discretionary dollars with the TransNet funding designated for this project. The fact that this project could be implemented by 2010 also represents an opportunity to implement one of our TransNet projects that would provide near-term benefit to the region. The ITOC is requested to review and comment on this project and to support the proposal to apply for federal Very Small Starts funding. Staff will be returning to the ITOC in September to discuss the update of the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and Plan of Finance, at which time the incorporation of this project as part of the EAP will be addressed in further detail.

Next step actions are outlined below:
- 7/20: Transportation Committee action to endorse Very Small Starts application
- 7/27: Board of Directors action to endorse Very Small Starts application
- 9/15: Submittal of Very Small Starts application to FTA

**Attachments:** 1. Mid-City Rapid Bus Very Small Starts Project Map
Mid-City Rapid Bus
Very Small Starts Project

Legend
- **Transit Route**
- **Station**
- **Phase I Signal Priority**
- **Phase I Station and Intersection Improvements**
- **Transit Lane**
On June 22, 2007, the SANDAG Board released the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for public review and comment. Staff will present an overview of draft plan and describe the upcoming RTP public outreach workshops. Members are encouraged to comment on the draft plan and attend one of the workshops.

A copy of the agenda item from the June 22, 2007 Board meeting is attached for information. ITOC members should have received a separate letter containing a CD copy of the draft 2007 RTP. An announcement regarding the workshops with the dates and locations also is attached.

Attachments:  
1. SANDAG July 6, 2007, Board of Directors Agenda Report on the Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan  
2. RTP Workshop Announcement
Introduction

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is one component of a much larger vision to sustain and improve our region’s quality of life. The larger vision is the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004 to serve as the foundation for integrating land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional smart growth framework. The RTP is the public policy component for how people and goods will move around the San Diego region through the year 2030. Required by state and federal regulations, the RTP contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the surface transportation system, and better coordinate land use and transportation planning. The 2007 RTP is the transportation component of the RCP and is compatible with the RCP.

The 2007 RTP is the product of collaboration between SANDAG and its transportation partners: all 18 cities and the County, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), the North County Transit District (NCTD), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). A Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group assisted in the RTP development, providing input to staff and the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Stakeholders Working Group consists of diverse representatives from community, environmental, economic development, and building interest groups from around the region. Local agency planners and engineers also assisted in the RTP development through the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group.

Similar to MOBILITY 2030, the Draft 2007 RTP is based on a Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario, which reflects a $58 billion level of investment through the year 2030. At the same time, the Draft RTP includes a Revenue Constrained scenario based on a $41 billion investment level through the year 2030. The RTP would provide more priority improvements and services to meet the 2030 travel demands of the region. Following public review of the Draft 2007 RTP and Draft EIR, the Final 2007 RTP and Final EIR would come to the Board for adoption in November 2007.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to: (1) accept the Draft 2007 RTP, for distribution; (2) authorize staff to distribute the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the 2007 RTP as soon as it is available; and (3) schedule a public hearing on the Draft 2007 RTP and Draft EIR for the September 14, 2007, Policy Board meeting and set September 17, 2007, as the closing date for public comments.
Discussion

A Plan for Better Mobility

The 2007 RTP was developed around four main components: Land Use, Systems Development, Systems Management, and Demand Management. Each component has a unique yet interdependent role in improving mobility and travel in the San Diego region through 2030. Highlights from the 2007 RTP within each mobility component include:

- **Land Use-Transportation Connection: Growing Smarter** – The RCP was adopted in 2004, providing a regional blueprint to improve connections between land use and transportation plans using smart growth principles. A follow-on product of the RCP is the Smart Growth Concept Map, accepted by the Board in June 2006 for planning purposes and development of the 2007 RTP. The Smart Growth Concept Map illustrates a preferred planning concept for the region and is the framework for prioritizing public land use and transportation investments in the region. The map defines approximately 200 areas where smart growth development exists or could be built, and provides a basis for planning appropriate transportation facilities and transit services in the 2007 RTP. While the RTP is based on adopted general plans, analysis shows that developing the potential areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map would provide numerous mobility benefits for the region. The 2007 RTP includes $206 million of TransNet-incentive funds through 2030 to foster the integration of smart growth land uses and transportation facilities.

- The Regional Transit Plan also was updated in the 2007 RTP, to both better serve identified smart growth areas and to incorporate some of the key recommendations from the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR). Conducted by an outside peer review panel after the last RTP, the ITPR focused on improving the role of public transportation in addressing mobility needs in the San Diego region, and enhancing the connection between land use and transit.

- The RTP also includes new sections on collaboration with the tribal governments in the San Diego region, extensive details of the region’s habitat plans and the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program, and a discussion of the energy implications of the transportation sector and the link to greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Systems Development: Increased Capacity and Travel Choices** – The focus of the RTP remains the flexible Managed Lane/High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) network that accommodates transit, as well as carpools, vanpools, and fee-paying Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) drivers. When implemented, the improvements in the RTP will substantially improve the region’s highway and roadway networks, supporting new or improved high-quality regional transit services, and facilitate goods movement. The revenues in the RTP cannot build all of the 2030 Unconstrained Needs, so the RTP first includes commitments to projects in the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP), and then a balanced distribution of funds to high-priority highway and transit projects as determined using Board-adopted evaluation criteria. Criteria were updated for the 2007 RTP, providing more emphasis for projects supporting smart growth development.

- Based on input from the ITPR, transit market research, and the MTS/NCTD short-range transit plans, a number of key elements were identified to guide the refinement of the Regional Transit Plan. Seeking to maximize the role public transportation can play in addressing regional mobility needs, implementation of the Regional Transit Plan would include: a strong
investment in the operations and rehabilitation of the existing system, TransNet EAP projects such as the Interstate 15 (I-15) Bus Rapid Transit, transit priority measures on arterials, rail grade separations, transit station and parking improvements, and future transit guideways such as Downtown San Diego to Kearny Mesa. There is particular attention to the transit customer in the RTP, with low-floor vehicles and smart fare Compass Cards to allow for easier and speedier boarding, along with real-time information on when the next vehicle will be arriving.

- The San Diego Regional Goods Movement Action Plan (GMAP) was accepted by the Board in September 2006 as the first step in evaluating a long-term freight strategy for the border region. The GMAP includes a prioritized list of good movement projects, ranging from border freeways, toll roads and Ports of Entry, to marine terminal access and improvements. The RTP assumes an additional $1.8 billion in goods movement projects outside the normal highway and transit projects, funded by unique sources that would not compete with other RTP projects.

- Several new toll facilities also were included in the RTP. State Route (SR) 11 has always been planned as the access facility to the new border crossing at East Otay Mesa, but it is now assumed to be a toll facility. In addition, the I-5 Managed Lanes north of SR 76 and the I-15 Managed Lanes north of SR 78 were added to the RTP as toll facilities. This approach addresses the growing congestion in these North County corridors without impacting scarce public investment dollars elsewhere in the region.

- When deciding the level of investment for the 2007 RTP, the Board included an additional $2 billion for transportation facilities and improvements to be distributed to local jurisdictions. This is in addition to the residential development impact fee to be collected by local jurisdictions through the TransNet Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP). The RTCIP is dedicated for improvements to the Regional Arterial System, and the system plan was updated in cooperation with all the local jurisdictions.

- **Systems Management: Making Better Use of What We Have** - Billions of dollars have already been invested in roads and transit in the San Diego region. SANDAG needs to maximize the return on this significant investment through better management and more efficient operation of the existing networks. A wide range of systems management strategies totaling more than a half billion dollars is included in the RTP. These include expanded Freeway Service Patrol to clear incidents quickly, and the Advanced Traveler Information System (511) for real-time data via phone and Internet. The new Integrated Performance Management Systems Network will interconnect the region’s local transportation management centers, from freeways, arterials, and the transit system.

- **Demand Management: Taking Pressure off the System** - Steps to reduce peak-period travel or change when and how people travel will become increasingly important in the future. Demand Management focuses on encouraging alternatives to driving alone and minimizing demand on the transportation system during peak periods. RideLink is the regional transportation demand management program that offers a regional vanpool program, regional bike locker program, and a regional subsidy program to provide start-up funds to employers to provide their employees with financial incentives to try new ways to commute. The funding for Demand Management was increased in the 2007 RTP, to further encourage teleworking and flexible work hours to help manage peak demand.
Financial Scenarios

The 2007 RTP assumes a $58 billion level of investment for the development, operation, and maintenance of our transportation facilities and services. This assumes both current sources of transportation revenues as well as future revenues from local, state, and federal sources. Examples are increases in state and federal gas taxes based on historical trends, and state and federal funds to improve local or regional infrastructure impacted by the recent growth in global and binational trade. Once the RTP is adopted, staff will work with the Board to evaluate and possibly pursue potential funding sources.

The 2007 RTP also includes the $41 billion Revenue Constrained Scenario that only assumes traditional sources of funds. Required by federal law in any RTP, this scenario is analyzed for its ability to meet air quality conformity standards.

Next Steps

Upon Board action, the Draft 2007 RTP will be circulated to local jurisdictions, MTS, NCTD, Caltrans, the Stakeholders Working Group, and other interested parties, and will be available on the SANDAG Web site. The Draft EIR will be released as soon as it is available. Major milestones include:

- June 22, 2007: Release of the Draft RTP
- August 3, 2007: Release of the Draft EIR
- September 14, 2007: Public Hearing on Draft RTP/EIR
- September 17, 2007: Close of public comment period for Draft RTP/EIR (The comment period may be extended depending on the actual release date of the EIR.)
- October 19, 2007: Transportation Committee reviews RTP/EIR comments
- November 30, 2007: SANDAG Board certifies Final EIR, approves air quality conformity finding, and adopts Final 2007 RTP

Public Involvement Program

Public outreach is a vital component of the 2007 RTP, and the details to date are contained in Appendix C of the Draft RTP. This appendix includes the results of the community-based outreach program, where seven competitive mini-grants were awarded to engage community-based participation in setting regional transportation priorities. The outreach effort will continue through September to invite public comments and participation in completing the Final RTP. Major public workshops will be held throughout the County in July on the following days:

- July 17, 6 to 8 p.m., Encinitas Community Center
- July 19, 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., Balboa Park, War Memorial Building
- July 23, 6 to 8 p.m., Chula Vista City Hall
- July 25, 6 to 8 p.m., San Marcos Community Center
- July 26, 6 to 8 p.m., Ronald Reagan Community Center, El Cajon
Note: Printed copies of the 2007 RTP have been mailed to Board Members and Alternates, City Managers, and key staff. The 2007 RTP may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=292&fuseaction=projects.detail, and CDs of the document are available by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950. Technical Appendices for the 2007 RTP will be available on the SANDAG Web site following the June 22 Board meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element No. 3000400
Please join us at one of the workshops to:

- Provide input into the $58 billion plan to improve the region’s freeway, transit, and road systems
- Learn about programs to reduce congestion during rush hour
- Discover how smart growth better connects our homes and jobs
- Learn about the steps being taken to improve the efficiency of our transportation system through technology

**Tuesday, July 17**
6 to 8 p.m.
Encinitas Community Center
1140 Oakcrest Park Dr.
Encinitas, CA 92024

**Thursday, July 19**
11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Balboa Park War Memorial Building Auditorium - north end of Zoo at Park Blvd. and Zoo Dr. across from Roosevelt Middle School
San Diego, CA 92101
A light lunch will be provided.

**Monday, July 23**
6 to 8 p.m.
Chula Vista City Hall
276 Fourth Ave.
Chula Vista, CA 91919

**Wednesday, July 25**
6 to 8 p.m.
San Marcos Community Center
3 Civic Center Dr.
San Marcos, CA 92069

**Thursday, July 26**
6 to 8 p.m.
Ronald Reagan Community Center
195 E. Douglas Ave.
El Cajon, CA 92020

For more information Maps to each workshop are available at www.sandag.org/2007rtp or can be requested by phone or e-mail. Driving and transit information are included on each map. Bilingual English/Spanish staff will participate in all workshops and materials will be available in Spanish. If you cannot attend a workshop or want to give us your views, visit www.sandag.org/2007rtp. For more information, call Rachel Kennedy at (619) 699-1929.
LAKE HODGES BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT

Introduction

SANDAG has programmed a total of $4.375 million to date toward the bicycle and pedestrian bridge being developed by the San Dieguito River Park over Lake Hodges. The total budget for the bridge is about $9.5 million. In March 2007, when the SANDAG Board approved the allocation of $1.875 million from future TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety funds for this project, the ITOC requested that SANDAG take an active role in providing oversight on the project and that the River Park provide a quarterly status report on the progress of the project.

Since that time, SANDAG staff consulted with the River Park staff regarding their construction bid documents, the project has been advertised, and a contract has been awarded. This report represents the first quarterly report on the bridges progress.

Discussion

The Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Phase Two project went out to bid on April 25, 2007. The bid deadline was June 6, 2007. Five bids were received from the following firms: FCI, Skaar, Marathon, Weir, and Reyes Construction. At SANDAG’s suggestion, the bid package was set up so that if the bids exceeded the funds available, a contract could still be awarded for a portion of the work. This was accomplished by providing a Base Bid for the bridge substructure, an Additive Alternative A for the superstructure, and an Additive Alternative B for the railing and lighting.

The lowest bid, $6,679,275 (Base Bid plus Alternatives A and B) which came from the firm FCI, exceeded the construction budget for the project by about $600,000, even after optional electrical conduit and lighting features are eliminated. River Park staff met with SANDAG engineering staff to review the bids, and SANDAG staff concurred that the FCI bid was the optimal bid. The firm is working for Caltrans on the adjacent site, they were the contractors for Phase One of the Lake Hodges Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge project, and they are the only contractor in town who has previously built a stress-ribbon bridge like the Lake Hodges Bridge. Under federal funding rules however, the River Park cannot award a partial contract that does not result in a project with public utility.
After considering these facts, the San Dieguito River Park Board of Directors awarded the contract to FCI Constructors on June 15, 2007. The $600,000 shortfall will be needed in about 1 1/2 years. During that time the River Park will seek additional grants or donations. The River Park Board committed to fund whatever remains of the shortfall by the time it is needed if sufficient grants and/or donations have not been secured by borrowing, obtaining a mortgage on the San Dieguito River Park office, or assessing the River Park's member agencies. Since that time the River Park has obtained an additional grant for $347,000 from the State Resources Agency, lowering the shortfall to $253,000.

**Next Steps**

Construction is expected to begin September 16, 2007 (after the bird nesting season restrictions end). No construction will occur from March 16, 2008 to September 15, 2008. Construction will resume September 16, 2008, and be complete by March 16, 2009.

Attachment: 1. San Dieguito River Park Trails – Lake Hodges Area

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
San Dieguito River Park Trails
Lake Hodges Area

[Map of San Dieguito River Park Trails with marked locations and trails]
Action Requested: REVIEW AND COMMENT/SUPPORT

TRANSNET EXTENSION SENIOR TRANSPORTATION MINI-GRANT PROGRAM

Introduction

Since 1988, TransNet, the ½% sales tax for local transportation projects has been instrumental in expanding the transportation system, reducing traffic congestion, and bringing critical transit projects to life. SANDAG leverages these funds with state and federal resources to maximize financial resources to the region.

The recent extension of TransNet includes a mini-grant program for specialized transportation services for seniors. The Ordinance states that:

“Three and one-fourth percent of the funds made available under Section 4(C) shall be used to support a competitive grant program for nonprofit organizations and local agencies. The funds shall be used to provide specialized transportation services for seniors focusing on innovative and cost-effective approaches to providing improved senior transportation, including, but not limited to, shared group services, special shuttle services using volunteer forces, and brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services.”

This agenda item discusses the senior mini-grant program in more detail and the process that will be used by SANDAG in selecting projects to be funded.

Discussion

The TransNet Extension funds the Senior Mini-Grant program by setting aside 3.25 percent out of the total 16.5 percent in annual TransNet revenues allocated for transit operating and capital purposes. This will yield approximately $1 million each year when funding becomes available in FY 2009. Funds will be awarded through a competitive grant process. As the regional agency, SANDAG will consider transportation services that address the transportation needs of seniors in all parts of the region for distribution of mini-grant funds. The Senior Mini-Grant program is targeted toward older adults and provides another source of funding for senior transportation programs in addition to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Job Access and Reverse Commute (Section 5316), Elderly and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310), and New Freedom (Section 5317) programs.

The goal of the Senior Mini-Grant program is to improve mobility for seniors throughout the County. SANDAG will provide financial assistance for transportation services planned, designed, and
carried out to meet the special transportation needs of elderly individuals in all areas – urban, suburban, and rural. Since coordination among agencies increases the cost-effectiveness of dollars spent, projects that promote coordination will be favored. The Senior Mini-Grant program may be most effective if coordinated with the federal grant programs mentioned earlier to make the most efficient use of all available local, state, and federal resources.

**Proposed Grant Application Procedures and Processes**

The Senior Mini-Grant program funding can be used for projects throughout San Diego County. The initial project application consists of the program-specific requirements detailed in this package of forms and instructions. Eligible applicants include local government agencies, tribal governments, social service agencies, private and public transportation operators, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, and non-profit organizations.

Senior Mini-Grant program funds are intended to fund **innovative and flexible programs** that support the transportation needs of older adults. It is the intent of this program to use the existing level of funding to provide the highest level of transportation services for older adults possible. Therefore, projects that offer new programs or expanded services are encouraged. The funding may be used to continue existing programs; however, programs or projects that have been operating longer will be scored against progressively higher cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and service-effectiveness indicators. Grants may be requested for up to one year with two one-year options. The extension of the grant for the two one-year options will be contingent upon the program achieving the performance goals, which will be defined by the maximum number of points possible for all of the three performance indicators and the continued availability of the funds.

Senior Mini-Grant funds may be used for planning, capital, or operating costs of services and facilities that improve mobility for older adults. Eligible projects includes travel training programs, volunteer driver and aide programs, paratransit, the brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services, and capital projects, such as purchasing vehicles and supporting accessible taxis, rider-sharing, and vanpooling programs.

Funds can be used to support up to 80 percent (80/20 match) for all operating projects. Fare revenue generated on the service to be supported may not be used as matching funds for operating grants. For capital projects, funds can be used to support up to 20 percent (20/80 match) of all costs. Mini-Grant funding can be used to leverage the federal dollars for similar programs that are available. The local match for these projects can be any source except for user fees, including in kind.

Projects will be awarded through a competitive selection process. A review committee comprised of staff from SANDAG and non-applicant agencies, such as state agencies, municipalities, and social services agencies will review, score, and rank the project applications. The list of selected projects will then be submitted to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in November 2008 and to the SANDAG Board of Directors for final approval in December 2008. This approved list of projects will be published and funded using TransNet funding.
Coordinated Planning

SAFETEA-LU, the Transportation Reauthorization Act passed in 2005, requires that funding for three federal programs be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. Three federal programs, Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, are available to assist in funding transportation programs geared towards transportation disadvantaged groups, including seniors. These three funding sources are available to public transit operators, as well as human service agencies, non-profits, and private agencies providing transportation. Federal legislation requires that projects be included in the Coordinated Plan in order to be eligible for funding.

A Coordinated Plan is intended to identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, and to provide strategies for meeting those local needs and prioritizing transportation services for funding and implementation. The intent of this requirement is to provide incentives for the coordination among health and human service agencies, public, private, and non-profit transportation providers to create efficiencies in service delivery, reduce duplication of services, and address any gaps in service for the targeted populations.

Since the goal of the Senior Mini-Grant program is to provide the highest level of transportation services for older adults possible, any efficiencies that can be achieved through the coordinated planning process will help in achieving this goal. Therefore, staff recommends we require projects to be funded by the Senior Mini-Grant program to also be derived from the Coordinated Plan.

Attachments: 1. Draft 2008 TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Application Form
2. Summary of Available Federal Funding Sources for Senior Transportation-Related Services

Key Staff Contact: Danielle Kochman, (619) 699-1921, dko@sandag.org
TransNet
Senior Mini-Grant Program

Competitive Grant Application
Federal Fiscal Year 2008 Funding Cycle

September 2008
Section 1

Senior Mini-Grant Program Overview
Background

A. TransNet

Since 1988, TransNet, the 1/2% sales tax for local transportation projects has been instrumental in expanding the transportation system, reducing traffic congestion, and bringing critical transit projects to life.

In November 2004, 67 percent of voters approved a 40-year extension of TransNet, which will generate an additional $14 billion for public transit, highway, and local street and road improvements. SANDAG leverages these funds with state and federal resources to improve the region’s transportation infrastructure and tackle growing traffic congestion head-on.

The recent extension of TransNet includes a mini-grant program for specialized transportation services for seniors. The ordinance states that:

“Three and one-fourth percent of the funds made available under Section 4(C) shall be used to support a competitive grant program for nonprofit organizations and local agencies. The funds shall be used to provide specialized transportation services for seniors focusing on innovative and cost-effective approaches to providing improved senior transportation, including, but not limited to, shared group services, special shuttle services using volunteer forces, and brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services.”

B. Senior Mini-Grant Program

The TransNet Extension funds the Senior Mini-Grant program by setting aside 3.25 percent out of the total 16.5 percent in annual TransNet revenues allocated for transit operating and capital purposes. This will yield approximately $1 million each year when funding becomes available in FY 2009. Funds will be awarded through a competitive grant process. As the regional agency, SANDAG will consider transportation services that address the transportation needs of seniors in all parts of the region for distribution of mini-grant funds. The Senior Mini-Grant program is targeted toward older adults and to provide another source of funding for senior transportation programs in addition to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Job Access and Reverse Commute (Section 5316), Elderly and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310), and New Freedom (Section 5317) programs.
Since Coordination among agencies increases the cost-effectiveness of dollars spent, projects that demonstrate coordination will be favored. This will allow the projects to collaboratively provide the most amount of service possible with existing dollars.

The goal of the Senior Mini-Grant program is to improve mobility for seniors throughout the County. SANDAG will provide financial assistance for transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of elderly individuals in all areas – urban, suburban, and rural. The program requires coordination with Federally assisted programs and services in order to make the most efficient use of resources.
Grant Application Procedures

The Senior Mini-Grant program funding can be used for projects throughout San Diego County. The initial project application consists of the program-specific requirements detailed in this package of forms and instructions.

A. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants may include:

- Local government agencies
- Tribal governments
- Social services agencies
- Private and public transportation operators
- Non-profit organizations

B. Eligible Use of Program Funds

Senior Mini-Grant program funds are intended to fund innovative and flexible programs that support the transportation needs of older adults. It is the intent of this program to use the existing level of funding to provide the highest level of transportation services for older adults possible. Therefore, projects that offer new programs or expanded services are encouraged. The funding may be used to continue existing programs; however, programs or projects that have been operating longer will be scored against progressively higher cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and service-effectiveness indicators. Since the intent is for this funding to provide the highest level of transportation services for older adults possible, cost effective solutions are encouraged.

C. Eligible Projects

Senior Mini-Grant program funds may be used for planning, capital, or operating costs of services and facilities that improve mobility for older adults. Eligible projects includes travel training programs, volunteer driver and aide programs, paratransit, the brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services, and capital projects, such as purchasing vehicles and supporting accessible taxis, rider-sharing, and vanpooling programs.

D. Cost-Sharing/Match Requirement

Funds can be used to support up to 80 percent (80/20 match) for all operating projects. Fare revenue generated on the service to be supported may not be used as matching funds for operating grants. For capital projects, funds can be used to support up to 20
percent (20/80 match) of all costs. This funding can be used to leverage the federal dollars for similar programs that are available. The local match for these projects can be any source except for user fees, including in kind.

E. Project Selection

Projects will be awarded through a competitive selection process. A review committee comprised of staff from SANDAG and non-applicant agencies, such as state agencies, municipalities and social services agencies will review, score, and rank the project applications. The list of selected projects will then be submitted to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in November 2008 and to the SANDAG Board of Directors for final approval in December 2008. This approved list of projects will be published and funded using TransNet funding.

F. Project Eligibility

SAFETEA-LU, the Transportation Reauthorization Act passed in 2005, requires that funding for three federal programs be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. Three federal programs, Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, are available to assist in funding transportation programs geared toward transportation disadvantaged groups, including seniors. These three funding sources are available to public transit operators, as well as human service agencies, non-profits, and private agencies providing transportation. Federal legislation requires that projects be included in the Coordinated Plan in order to be eligible for funding.

A Coordinated Plan is intended to identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes and to provide strategies for meeting those local needs and prioritizing transportation services for funding and implementation. The intent of this requirement is to provide incentives for the coordination among health and human service agencies, public, private, and non-profit transportation providers to create efficiencies in service delivery, reduce duplication of services, and address any gaps in service for the targeted populations.

Since the goal of the Senior Mini-Grant program is to provide the highest level of transportation services for older adults possible, any efficiencies that can be achieved through the coordinated planning process will help in achieving this goal. Therefore, locally it is required that projects to be funded by the Senior Mini-Grant program must also be derived from the Coordinated Plan.
Grants may be requested for up to one year with two one-year options. The extension of the grant for the two one-year options will be contingent upon funding being available and the program achieving the performance goals, which will be defined by the maximum number of points possible for all of the three performance indicators. Programs including volunteer driver services may have lower standards for the passenger-per-vehicle service hour based on the number of seats available in their fleet of vehicles.

G. Pre-Application Meetings

SANDAG will host public pre-application meetings to review this package and answer questions. Meetings will be held in _______________________. 
Application Deadline

Six applications (an original and five copies) need to be submitted to SANDAG by October 19, 2008. SANDAG will not accept faxed or electronic applications. Each application will be reviewed, scored, and ranked. The recommendations will be forwarded to the SANDAG Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) for recommendation to the Transportation Committee for final approval. Following approval by the Transportation Committee the selected projects will be included in a RTIP amendment. When the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendment is approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the projects will be eligible to be funded as long as the grant recipient has signed all necessary agreements with SANDAG.

Applications should be submitted to: Dan Levy
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego CA 92101

Written questions will be accepted at the above address, through email at dle@sandag.org, or by fax at (619) 699-1905 until October 19, 2008. Answers to all questions will be posted on the SANDAG web site on the project home page:

http://www.sandag.org/Coordinated Plan

The responses to the questions will also be sent via e-mail to persons who register their e-mail address with SANDAG at the pre-proposal meeting. All answers will be posted or e-mailed out no later than Thursday, October 25, 2008.

The information in this application is a public record. Applicants should not include information that may be regarded as confidential.
Section 2

Senior Mini-Grant
Grant Application Form

Grant applications missing any portion of this form may be disqualified.
Please explain any omissions.
Application Checklist – Applications Due: October 19, 2008, 2:00 p.m.

Applicants should use this checklist to ensure that all applicable parts of the application and attachments are completed and submitted. Please provide explanations for any requested information that is missing from your application as omissions may result in disqualification. Please note that late applications will not be considered for funding. Late applications will be returned unopened if received after the October 19, 2008, 2 p.m., due date.

Parts A to G  Identification, Grant Summary, and Signature Page
☐ (A) Name
☐ (B) Project Location
☐ (C) Program
☐ (D) Project Type
☐ (E) Operating Project Information
☐ (F) Capital Project Information
☐ (G) Project Overview/Description

Part H  Signature Page

Parts I to N  Project Narrative
☐ (I) Project Needs/Goals and Objectives
☐ (J) Implementation Plan
☐ (K) Coordination and Program Outreach
☐ (L) Performance Indicators
☐ (M) Program Effectiveness
☐ (N) Innovation

Part O  Project Budget(s)
### A. Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Contact (optional):</td>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- □ Received grants from 5310 program in the past

### B. Project Location

Describe the geographic area that will be served by your transportation program. Attach a map of the service area as an appendix.

### C. Program (check one)

- □ TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program
- □ New Freedom Project – Wrong form. Please use New Freedom application
- □ Job Access and Reverse Commute Project – Wrong form. Please use JARC application

### D. Project Type (check all that apply)

- □ Capital Only (Complete section E)
- □ Operating Only (Complete Section D)

### E. Operating Project Information

- Number of users to be served by new or improved service, facilities or equipment:
- Total number of trips to be provided annually:
- Percentage of population served that are seniors: %
- Amount of grant request: $ Local Matching Funds: $
- Total Cost of Project (grant + match + fare revenue/user fee):
- Cost per trip: $
- Project Beginning and Ending Dates: _____ to _____

### F. Capital or Operating Project Information (existing or proposed)

- Number of users to be served by new or improved service, facilities or equipment:
- Percentage of senior residents in geographic area served: %
- Amount of grant request: $ Matching Funds: $
- Total Cost of Project (grant + match): $
- Project Beginning and Ending Dates: _____ to _____
G. Project Overview Description


H. Applicant Signature:

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this application is true and correct. The applicant will comply with the necessary local agreements if assistance is awarded.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature Applicant/Representative               Date

__________________________________________
Printed or typed Applicant/Representative

__________________________________________  __________________________
Title                                           Organization
Project Narrative

Please provide a brief narrative to describe the project. You must answer all parts of each question to be eligible to obtain full points. This narrative must not exceed ten pages. The project scoring criteria can be found in the next section.

I. Project Need/Goals and Objectives (20 Points)

1. Describe the strategy, need or project from the Coordinated Plan (including page #’s) that your grant application project seeks to address.

2. Briefly describe the client group currently served by your agency.

3. Describe how project activities will mitigate the transportation need.

4. Describe the specific community this project will serve, and provide pertinent demographic data and/or maps.

5. What are the project’s goals and objectives?

J. Implementation Plan (25 Points)

1. Describe when the project will begin, or if already in existence, when it began.

2. If the project is an existing program, please explain why it needs funding from the Senior Mini-Grant Program.

3. Define the length of the time period to complete the project, or when the project will end.

4. Describe key personnel assigned to this project.

5. Provide evidence of your agency’s ability to manage the project.

6. Estimate the number of seniors that will be served, and/or the number of trips that will be served by the operation or capital equipment that will be supported with this grant.

7. Provide an operational plan for delivering service. Include route map, if applicable, and hours of operation and days in service. OR Provide an implementation plan for completing a capital project, including key milestones and estimated completion date.

8. Explain how this project relates to other services or facilities provided by your agency or firm and demonstrate how it can be achieved within your technical capacity.

9. Discuss sources other than this grant that were considered and why these are not available or appropriate to fund the proposed project.
K. Coordination and Program Outreach (15 Points)

1. Describe how the project will be coordinated with public and/or private transportation and social service agencies serving seniors. (vehicle sharing, dispatching or scheduling, maintenance, staff training programs, joint procurement of services and supplies, active participation in local social service transportation planning process, back-up transportation, client trips).

2. Describe how project sponsor will continue to involve key stakeholders throughout the project.

3. Describe efforts to market the project, and ways to promote public awareness of the program.

4. Letters of support should be obtained from key stakeholders and attached to the grant application.

L. Performance Indicators (15 Points)

1. Please complete the performance indicators section found in the following pages.

M. Program Effectiveness (5 Points)

1. Please explain why the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service to the demonstrated need.

2. Describe a plan for monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved.

3. If the project is expected to continue beyond the period of this grant please explain how it will be funded. Please highlight any changes expected in the future.

N. Innovation (5 Points)

1. Describe any proposed use of innovative approaches that will be employed for this project.

2. Discuss what is innovative about the approach and how the innovations could be applied to other services in the region.

O. Project Budget:

1. Project sponsor should provide a complete budget indicating project revenues and expenditures in the format provided in the next section.

2. Estimate the proposed cost per trip (or other unit of service).

3. Describe efforts to ensure its cost-effectiveness.
Please complete the appropriate budget page(s) from the following pages. If your project is seeking money for a single use (e.g., Operations) you need only to complete a single page (e.g. Operations). However if your project includes both operating and capital) you must complete all applicable budget pages**PLUS** the rollup page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Expense Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Expense Subtotal (Add lines 161-168)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Revenue - Other Federal Grants (list on attached page)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Revenue - Other Grants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Revenue - Donations/Fund Raising</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Revenue – Other</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>In kind contributions (explain on attached page)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Revenue Subtotal (Add lines 170-174)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Project Net Cost (Subtract Line 175 from Line 169)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Revenue - Fares &amp; User Fees</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Eligible Project Cost (Subtract Line 177 from Line 176)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>80% of Eligible Project Cost (Line 178)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Operating Grant Request Amount (not to exceed Line 179)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior Mini-Grant Capital Budgets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Expense Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Expense Subtotal (Add lines 181-188)</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Revenue - Other Federal Grants (list on attached page)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Revenue - Other Grants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Revenue - Donations/Fund Raising</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Revenue - Other</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>In kind contributions (explain on attached page)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Revenue Subtotal (Add lines 190-194)</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Project Net Cost (Subtract Line 195 from Line 189)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Revenue - Fares &amp; User Fees</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Eligible Project Cost (Subtract Line 197 from Line 196)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>20% of Eligible Project Cost (Line 198)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Capital Grant Request Amount (not to exceed Line 199)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior Mini-Grant Roll Up

*Use this sheet only if your project involves more than one budget sheet (Capital + Operating)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Expense Items</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mini-Grant Eligible Project Cost (from Line 78 of Operating Budget)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Mini-Grant Requested Grant Amount (From Line 80 of Operating Budget)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Mini-Grant Eligible Project Cost (from Line 98 of Capital Budget)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Mini-Grant Requested Grant Amount (From Line 100 of Capital Budget)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total Mini-Grant Eligible Project Costs (Line I + Line K)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Total Mini Grant Requested Grant Amount (Line J + Line L)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior Mini-Grant Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Number of Years in Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Total Number of One Way Passenger Trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Total Number of Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Average Number of Service Hours per Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Total Number of Vehicle Service Hours (line 222 multiplied by line 223)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Operating Cost (line 169)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger (line 226 divided by line 222)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour (line 225 divided by line 224)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Passengers per Vehicle Service Hour (line 221 divided by line 224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Scoring Criteria

The following information and scoring criteria will be used to score and rate project applications for the Senior Mini-Grant program.

I. Project Needs/Goals and Objectives.............................................................. 20 points

The project should directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in the 2008 – 2011 Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (The Coordinated Plan). Project application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project was derived from the strategies identified in the Coordinated Plan.

J. Implementation Plan ...................................................................................... 25 points

For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, including days and hours of operation for operating grants. The applicant must describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan. The project application should indicate the number of persons expected to be served, and the number of trips (or other units of service) expected to be provided. The service operations plan should identify key personnel assigned to this project and their qualifications. Project sponsors should demonstrate their institutional capability to carry out the service delivery aspect of the project as described.

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, the applicant must provide a solid rationale for use of Senior Mini-Grant funds for this purpose, and demonstrate that no other sources of funds are appropriate to meet this need. Also, provide an implementation plan and timelines for completing the capital project.

K. Coordination and Program Outreach............................................................ 15 points

Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources. Project sponsors should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project. Project sponsors should also describe how they would promote public awareness of the project. Letters of support from key stakeholders should be attached to the grant application.
L. **Performance Indicators** ................................................................. 15 points

There will be three different performance indicators that will be evaluated to measure the effectiveness of the project in meeting the identified goals. They are as follows: Cost Efficiency, measured by the operating cost per vehicle service hour; Cost Effectiveness, measured by the operating costs per passenger; and Service Effectiveness, measured by passengers per vehicle revenue hour. These three performance indicators will be worth a maximum of 5 points each and will be based on the matrices below:

### Cost Efficiency
**Operating Cost in Dollars per Vehicle Service Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 70</td>
<td>&gt; 65</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>&gt; 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65 ≥ x ≥ 70</td>
<td>60 ≥ x ≥ 65</td>
<td>55 ≥ x ≥ 60</td>
<td>50 ≥ x ≥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60 &gt; x ≥ 65</td>
<td>55 &gt; x ≥ 60</td>
<td>50 &gt; x ≥ 55</td>
<td>45 &gt; x ≥ 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≤ 60</td>
<td>≤ 55</td>
<td>≤ 50</td>
<td>≤ 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Effectiveness
**Operating Cost in Dollars per Passenger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt; 32</td>
<td>&gt; 29</td>
<td>&gt; 26</td>
<td>&gt; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 ≥ x ≥ 32</td>
<td>26 ≥ x ≥ 29</td>
<td>23 ≥ x ≥ 26</td>
<td>20 ≥ x ≥ 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26 &gt; x ≥ 29</td>
<td>23 &gt; x ≥ 26</td>
<td>20 &gt; x ≥ 23</td>
<td>17 &gt; x ≥ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≤ 26</td>
<td>≤ 23</td>
<td>≤ 20</td>
<td>≤ 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Effectiveness
**Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Proposed/1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4+ year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 ≥ x &gt; 2</td>
<td>2 ≥ x &gt; 3</td>
<td>3 ≥ x &gt; 4</td>
<td>4 ≥ x &gt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 ≥ x &gt; 3</td>
<td>3 ≥ x &gt; 4</td>
<td>4 ≥ x &gt; 5</td>
<td>5 ≥ x &gt; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>≥ 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Program Effectiveness ........................................................................................................ 5 points

The project will be scored based on the project sponsor’s ability to demonstrate that the proposed project is the most appropriate match of service delivery to the need. Points will also be awarded for projects that have a high probability of being self-sufficient in future years.

N. Innovation ......................................................................................................................... 5 points

Provides new or innovative service concepts or facilities that have the potential for improving access and mobility for the senior population and may have future application elsewhere in the region.

O. Project Budget ................................................................................................................. 15 points

Projects must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Proposals should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period. Proponent shall demonstrate how using this funding leverages resources to the maximum possible extent.
**Summary of Available Federal Funding Sources**

**For Senior Transportation and Related Services**

On August 10, 2005, the President signed into law the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). With guaranteed funding for highways, highway safety, and public transportation totaling $244.1 billion, SAFETEA-LU represents the largest surface transportation investment in our Nation’s history. The two landmark bills that brought surface transportation into the 21st century—the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)—shaped the highway program to meet our Nation’s changing transportation needs. SAFETEA-LU builds on this firm foundation, supplying the funds and refining the programmatic framework for investments needed to maintain and grow our vital transportation infrastructure.

SAFETEA-LU addresses the many challenges facing our transportation system today—challenges such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment—as well as laying the groundwork for addressing future challenges. SAFETEA-LU promotes more efficient and effective Federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving State and local transportation decision makers more flexibility for solving transportation problems in their communities.

SAFETEA-LU continues a strong fundamental core formula program emphasis coupled with targeted investment, featuring Safety, Equity, Innovative Finance, Congestion Relief, Mobility and Productivity, Efficiency, Environmental Stewardship, and Environmental Streamlining. Specialized funding programs for senior transportation and related services include:

**JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC) PROGRAM** *(SECTION 5316)*

The JARC program provides formula funding to support the development and maintenance of Job Access and Reverse Commute projects designed improve transportation for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment. The available Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007 JARC apportionment for the urbanized portion of San Diego County is about $1.33 million. SANDAG is the designated recipient for the JARC Program funds and will allocate the money to service providers in the urbanized area of San Diego County.

**NEW FREEDOM (NF) PROGRAM** *(SECTION 5317)*

The purpose of the New Freedom program is to provide new public transportation services and public transportation alternatives beyond those currently required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101, et seq.) that assist individuals with disabilities with transportation. The available Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006 NF apportionment for the urbanized portion of San Diego County is $651,000. SANDAG is the designated recipient for the NF Program funds and will allocate the money to service providers in the urbanized area.
ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (SECTION 5310)

SANDAG coordinates the local process for awarding Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) Section 5310 money for elderly and disabled transportation. Funds from Section 5310 are allocated by formula to states for capital costs of providing services to the elderly and disabled. While in some states the program funds operations, only capital projects are eligible in California. SANDAG participates in evaluating local applications for Section 5310 funds. Eligible uses include purchase of vans, radio equipment, dispatch hardware or software, and other related equipment. The program is administered by the State and the funds are allocated annually by the California Transportation Commission. Effective in 2008, in order to be eligible the project must be included in the Coordinated Plan. The local match requirement is approximately 11 percent.
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

July 18, 2007

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9

Action Requested: INFORMATION

UPDATE ON THE TransNet PLAN OF FINANCE PROCESS

SANDAG staff continues the process of updating the Plan of Finance for the TransNet program of projects. This will be the first comprehensive update of the Plan of Finance since TransNet was extended by San Diego County voters in November 2004. The most recent update to the Plan of Finance only included Early Action Program projects.

The process for updating the Plan of Finance includes developing project implementation timelines, updating project cost estimates, defining cost escalation factors, and completing financial model runs to determine if adequate bonding capacity and state and federal matching funds are available to deliver the program.

At its May 15, 2007 meeting, staff reviewed project implementation timelines and cost trends with ITOC members. Since then, staff has completed updating the project cost estimates for the TransNet program of projects. These updated costs appear in Attachment 1.

The projects are shown as they appear in the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The draft RTP was released for review and comment in June 2007. The route/facility, limits, and improvements are shown in the attachment. In addition, the original TransNet Extension Ordinance project number or combination of project numbers is shown. Finally, the 2002 net capital costs (2002 dollars) are shown and compared to the updated 2006 net capital costs (2006 dollars). Net capital costs do not include environmental mitigation costs as these costs are funded by the $850 million TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). Current estimated total net capital costs have increased from $9.4 billion to $17.5 billion (rounded), an 86 percent increase. This compares closely to the 89 percent increase in the Caltrans construction price index during the same time period between 2002 and 2006.

Next steps include defining cost escalation factors and conducting initial financial model runs. Staff is completing an analysis for defining cost escalation factors. Preliminary information should be available for discussion at the September 2007 meeting. ITOC discussions on the development of the Plan of Finance will continue through the fall of this year.


Key Staff Contact: Richard Chavez, (619) 699-6989; rch@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Ordinance Project Number</th>
<th>2002 Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>2006 Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$594</td>
<td>$934</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Drive</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Drive</td>
<td>Vandegrift Boulevard</td>
<td>8F/14F</td>
<td>8F/14F+4ML</td>
<td>$773</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
<td>210%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Second St</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR94</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$3 $197</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML/MB</td>
<td>$1 $220</td>
<td>$481</td>
<td>$261</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Centre City Parkway</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>2 $120</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>Palomar Street</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>9 $113</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Palomar Street</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>10 $431</td>
<td>$884</td>
<td>$453</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>11 $295</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>12 $374</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>$498</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F/6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV/ML</td>
<td>17,32 $236</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>33 $240</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 54/SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>4F+2/6 F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
<td>38 $139</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>44 $99</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapview St</td>
<td>Dye Rd</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>39 $218</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$182</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR 76</td>
<td>Melrose Dr</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>43 $164</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td>266%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
<td>41 $495</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SR 94/SR 125</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>6,15,36  $493</td>
<td>$1,034</td>
<td>$541</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>Steele Canyon</td>
<td>4F/4C-2C</td>
<td>6F/4C</td>
<td>35 $88</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I-805 &amp; SR 54 interchange improvements (E to S)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13 $10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR 94 &amp; SR 125 Interchange</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34 $108</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FWY 2 FWY</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29 $136</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FWY 2 FWY</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30 $148</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 $197</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5 $148</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$-8</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18 $148</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28 $177</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$-7</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SR 75/SR 282</td>
<td>Glorietta Boulevard</td>
<td>Alamed Boulevard</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Construction Match</td>
<td>46 $25</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TransNet Extension Project Costs (millions)

### 2002 vs. 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Ordinance Project Number</th>
<th>2002 Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>2006 Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Border Improvements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Construction Match</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>San Ysidro</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Low-floor vehicles</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Low-floor vehicles</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 COASTER/ECR ¹</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Double tracking/BRT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$376</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>259%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 SPRINT/PAR ²</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Double tracking/BRT</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$669</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>240%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Mid-Coast</td>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>LRT/BRT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Super Loop</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Route 470</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Route 610</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$369</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$-55</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Route 611</td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Route 628</td>
<td>Otay Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>$541</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Route 680</td>
<td>San Ysidro</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | $9,445 | $17,532 | $8,087 | 86% |

**Caltrans Construction Price Index Increase 2002 to 2006:** 89%

### Notes:

¹ Double tracking or BRT service on El Camino Real (ECR), 2006 dollars shown are for double tracking.

² Double tracking or BRT service on Palomar Airport Road (PAR), 2006 dollars shown for rail extension and double tracking.

Highlighted projects are designated Early Action Program projects.