MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)
The CTAC may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, May 3, 2007
9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

SANDAG, Conference Room 8A
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA  92101-4231

Chair: Greg Humora, City of La Mesa
Vice Chair: Richard Leja, City of San Diego

Staff Contact: Charles “Muggs” Stoll
(619) 699-6945
(619) 699-0709 - Fax
mst@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)
• STATEWIDE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) BENCHMARKING STUDY PRESENTATION
• TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MEETING SUMMARY (Greg Humora)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>FORM 700 (Charles “Muggs” Stoll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>UPCOMING BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION ON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (Shelby Tucker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEETING SUMMARY (Greg Humora)**

CTAC is asked to review and approve the meeting summaries.

- April 5, 2007, Meeting
- April 12, 2007, Meeting

**FORM 700 (Charles “Muggs” Stoll)**

CTAC members and alternates are required to fill out Form 700: Statement of Economic Interests on an annual basis. The form can be downloaded from the Fair Political Practices Commission Web site at [http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.html?id=36](http://www.fppc.ca.gov/index.html?id=36). Signed forms must be turned in to Deborah Gunn at SANDAG and were due Monday, March 19, 2007.

**UPCOMING BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION ON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (Shelby Tucker)**

On January 12, 2007, a report on the Regional Comprehensive Plan’s Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy was provided to the SANDAG Board of Directors (Board). The report included updated cost estimates and potential revenue sources for each of three infrastructure areas, including Stormwater Management, Beach Sand Replenishment, and Habitat Preservation. The Board discussion was followed by additional discussions at the Board Retreat in late January. Based on the results of these discussions, it was determined that three policy forums need to be held on each of the three infrastructure types. Stormwater Management will be discussed at the Policy Board meeting on Friday, May 11, 2007. Staff will provide CTAC with an overview of what will be presented to the Board and would like CTAC’s input and feedback.
ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION
6.  2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) (Mike Hix)  INFORMATION

Staff will report on actions taken at the April 20, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting and the April 27, 2007, Board of Directors meeting on the Draft Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue scenarios for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). These scenarios will be included in the Draft 2007 RTP scheduled to be released in June 2007.

7.  STATEWIDE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) BENCHMARKING STUDY PRESENTATION (Richard Leja)  INFORMATION

A presentation will be made regarding the 2006 update of the Statewide Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Benchmarking Study. Copies of the study can be downloaded at http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/cabm/. The performance benchmarking study involves the collection of documented project costs and the creation of data models of the component costs of project delivery versus the total construction costs for projects throughout California. The 2006 update represents five years of continuous collaboration among the participating jurisdictions (Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose, and the City and County of San Francisco).

+8.  TransNet EXTENSION BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROVISIONS (Stephan Vance)  RECOMMEND APPROVAL

The TransNet Extension ordinance that takes effect in FY 2009 requires reasonable accommodation for bicycle and pedestrian travel in Congestion Relief projects using TransNet funds. The draft policy and guidelines for implementing this provision were previously discussed by CTAC, and at the March meeting, members requested an opportunity to discuss this provision with members of SANDAG’s Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group. The citizen representatives to that working group have been invited to this meeting for that purpose. Attached is the current version of the guidelines that CTAC is asked to recommend for approval by the Transportation Committee.

9.  ANNOUNCEMENTS  INFORMATION

CTAC members are encouraged to share items of interest.

10.  UPCOMING MEETINGS  INFORMATION

The next CTAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 7, 2007, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
MEETING SUMMARY, APRIL 5, 2007

Introduction

Greg Humora chaired the meeting. Meeting participants introduced themselves.

Meeting Summaries

CTAC approved the meeting summaries from the March 1, 15, and 26, 2007, meetings as written.

Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

RTCIP Workshop

Richard Chavez (SANDAG) announced that a workshop would be held today to explain and answer questions about the TransNet Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP).

Form 700: Statement of Economic Interest

Richard Chavez (SANDAG) encouraged members and alternates to turn in their Form 700.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Mike Hix (SANDAG) explained that the highway and transit networks were not yet available. Mike recommended that a special CTAC meeting be held next week. CTAC set a meeting for Thursday, April 12, 2007, to discuss.

Regional Arterial System (RAS) Update

Richard Leja (Vice Chair) provided a summary background on the RAS update. He stated that CTAC members had met and developed a list of 38 additional arterials to include to the updated RAS. This alternate CTAC recommendation is in addition to the SANDAG staff recommended arterials. CTAC voted unanimously to recommend the CTAC developed list to the Transportation Committee.
**ASCE San Diego Section - State Public Affairs Grant**

Clark Fernon (ASCE) announced that the San Diego Section had received a grant to develop Top Ten Lists for projects or policies that would most improve the region’s storm water system, arterial system, and open space parks. Clark stated that they were conducting outreach with cities/county to begin developing the lists. There was a general discussion on project prioritization and policies that might be included on a Top Ten list. Clark also explained that the San Diego Section would be doing advocacy for infrastructure improvements.

**SPRUNTER Smart Growth Stakeholders Working Group**

Christine Eary explained that the working group was focusing on smart growth opportunities around the SPRINTER stations. A tour of the station locations had been held. Christine stated that she would like more representation from CTAC. Greg Humora (Chair) recommended Mohamad Fakrraddine (County) and Larry Pierce (Vista).

**New Federal Requirements**

Sookyung Kim (SANDAG) explained there were new requirements for obtaining federal fund authorization. The RTCIP project number and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project listing now needs to be included when processing E-76 forms. Submittals that do not include these new requirements will be rejected. Sookyung distributed Table A.1 from the RTP that includes a line item for Regionally Significant Arterials and Local Freeway Access Interchanges.
MEETING SUMMARY, APRIL 12, 2007

Introduction

Greg Humora chaired the meeting. Meeting participants introduced themselves.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Mike Hix and Linda Culp (SANDAG) provided the highway and transit network materials and the results of the project rankings for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Revenue networks. They focused on the results of the project rankings and summarized the changes made since the last time the item was discussed at CTAC. The Revenue Constrained network involved changes to only three highway segments and no changes to the proposed transit projects. Four different Reasonably Expected scenarios were presented for consideration involving two revenue projections and various highway/transit funding mixes.

Several comments and questions were raised regarding the “High Vehicular Crash Rate” criteria. It was explained that it mainly resulted in scoring for a few of the rural conventional highway routes. Long segments of freeways typically have an accident rate below the statewide average.

There was a question regarding the limit of the proposed 10 Freeway Lanes + 4 Managed Lanes (10F+4ML) versus 8 Freeway Lanes + 4 Managed Lanes (8F+4ML) improvements on Interstate 805. It was suggested that the limit of the 10F+4ML should extend south from H Street to Telegraph Canyon Road.

Another comment suggested that the southern limits of major improvements proposed in the Reasonably Expected network for both Interstates 5 and 805 should extend further from the SR 905 interchange to the San Ysidro Port of Entry.

Finally, Fred Ludtke (Escondido) suggested that the presentation of the highway projects and their costs contained in any of the scenarios should fairly represent the amount of the proposed investment that supports transit service. He was concerned that the amount shown for transit may be seen as too low by some without the benefit of understanding the extent of the highway funds being used for lanes Bus Rapid Transit, Direct Access Ramps, etc.

The CTAC was reminded that the report would be subsequently presented to the Transportation Committee on April 20, 2007, and to the Board of Directors on April 27, 2007.
Background

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

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

What Constitutes Adequate Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Highway</td>
<td>* Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders. * Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads.</td>
<td>* Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway. * Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no less than 0.3 mile between crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Project</td>
<td>• Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand.</td>
<td>• Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.</td>
<td>• Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no less than 0.3 miles between crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed &gt;35 mph)</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed ≤ 35 mph)</td>
<td>• Shared roadway. Where planned average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder.</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Collector Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder.</td>
<td>• Not required with no fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder.</td>
<td>• Not required with 85th percentile speeds ≤ 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds &gt; 25 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Best Available Standards**

All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect’s California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the US Department of Transporations ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG’s Planning and Designing for Pedestrians is encouraged.
Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right-of-way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right-of-way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy 31 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.

When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded

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

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 31) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

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

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.
Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

**Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects**

When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee, in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

**Effective Implementation**

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