TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, May 2, 2008
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- AUTOMATED FARE COLLECTION - MTS FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT

- TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

- AMENDMENT TO THE MASTER MOU WITH NCTD TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE SPRINTER RAIL PROJECT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Transportation Committee 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 Transportation Committee 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 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF APRIL 18, 2008, MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (3 through 6)

+3. AUTOMATED FARE COLLECTION – MTS FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT (James Dreisbach-Towle) | APPROVE

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) has requested SANDAG procurement of additional fareboxes through SANDAG’s contract with GFI Genfare as part of the Automated Fare Collection (AFC) Project. The Transportation Committee is asked to: (1) authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Understanding with MTS for SANDAG procurement of fareboxes in substantially the same form as attached; and (2) approve the associated budget increase of $340,000 for the Automated Fare Collection System Project #1145700.

+4. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (Stephan Vance) | INFORMATION

Working under the direction of the Regional Planning Committee, SANDAG has been collaborating with an ad hoc working group of local agency staff to develop the smart growth incentive program funded through the TransNet Extension Ordinance. This report provides an overview of what the ad hoc working group will be recommending for the program.

+5. AMENDMENT TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO THE SPRINTER RAIL PROJECT (Jim Linthicum) | APPROVE

North County Transit District (NCTD) has requested additional assistance from SANDAG staff and on-call engineers to support the completion of the SPRINTER Project. The Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with NCTD needs to be amended accordingly. The Transportation Committee is asked to authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment 2 to Addendum 2 to the Master MOU with NCTD in substantially the same form as attached and take all other actions necessary to implement its provisions.
PROPOSED FY 2009 NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT SERVICE CHANGES
(Dave Schumacher)

SANDAG Board Policy No. 018 (Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation) calls for SANDAG review of all new and revised services and service adjustments of regional significance to ensure they are consistent with the Regional Short Range Transit Plan. The North County Transit District is proposing a number of service changes in FY 2009 related to its budget deficit; this item analyzes these proposed changes to assess where there may issues of regional significance.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, May 16, 2008, at 9 a.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

May 2, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF APRIL 18, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Jack Dale (City of Santee) at 9:03 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority [SDCRAA]), and a second by Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the March 21, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Clive Richard, a member of the public, expressed comments regarding the takeaway of transit funds in the state budget and asked this committee to make sure that funding is available for continuation of public transportation. He expressed his concerns that public transportation would regress to stagecoach days.

CONSENT ITEMS

3. CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE HIGH-SPEED PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM QUARTERLY UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is the state agency responsible for planning, constructing, and operating a high-speed train system serving California's major metropolitan areas. The proposed system stretches over 800 miles and would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Francisco, and Sacramento using a state-of-the-art, electrified system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour. SANDAG continues to monitor the work of the CHSRA. This report is the regular quarterly update to the Transportation Committee.

4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

At its meeting on June 22, 2007, the SANDAG Board approved the FY 2008 Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocation and claim for Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT) the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). FACT has requested an additional $10,000 from its TDA reserve to meet its expenditures for FY 2008. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2008-23, approving the amendment to the TDA claim.
A motion by Councilmember Hall and a second by Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 through 4, including adopting Resolution No. 2008-23.

**CHAIRS’ REPORTS**

5. **STATE ROUTE 905 STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Vice Chair Jack Dale asked Pedro Orso-Delgado, Director, Caltrans, District 11 to provide the monthly update of discussion by the State Route (SR) 905 Strike Team. Mr. Delgado stated that he provided a printed invitation to all members to the groundbreaking ceremony for the SR 905 Phase 1A project. He reported that the right-of-way settlements costs may exceed estimated/allocated funds. Caltrans and South Bay Expressway are working on an agreement to return monies from the sale of excess lands to the project to fund the interchange between SR 905 and SR 125. Phase 1B of the project will be funded with $91.6 million of Proposition 1B funds. Programmed construction should begin on this project by this time next year.

SANDAG is sponsoring legislation regarding the new Port of Entry (POE) at Otay Mesa east and the legislation passed senate committee hearings this week. He stated he had the opportunity to go to Washington, D.C. to talk about the presidential permit and that he received good feedback. Caltrans is responding to the comments regarding the tiered Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement and we have every indication that we will receive a presidential permit sometime in May 2008. The comments centered on the federal and state agencies’ concerns regarding the new process of a tiered environmental document and they aren’t used to seeing that. He expressed his thanks to the member agencies for their letters of support for the presidential permit. Funds for this project are also programmed in the TCIF.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

Muggs Stoll, TransNet Programming Manager stated that SANDAG is preparing a regional fare study and the consultant will be holding five outreach meetings over the next two weeks. He stated that the dates, times, and locations of these public meetings could be found on the SANDAG Web site.

Mayor David Druker (North County Coastal) asked for staff to provide a presentation on the regional fare study to the North County Transit District (NCTD) Board of Directors at its next Board meeting and commented that staff might want to consider doing the same for MTS.

**REPORTS**

6. **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM-REVIEW OF FUNDING PROGRAM’S SUBMITTED BY JURISDICTIONS (RECOMMEND)**

Charles "Muggs" Stoll, TransNet Program Manager and Marney Cox, Chief Economist presented the item. Mr. Stoll stated that the original TransNet ended March 31, 2008, and we are now officially working under the TransNet Extension Ordinance. Today’s item is one of the important aspects of the TransNet Extension Ordinance.
Mr. Stoll stated that the TransNet Extension Ordinance requires that all jurisdictions within San Diego County submit funding programs to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) by April 1, 2008, in accordance with the provisions of the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP). Included in this item are those funding programs which were submitted by all 19 jurisdictions on or before April 1, 2008. Each jurisdiction submitted evidence of an existing development fee program, a modification of an existing development fee program, or a new development fee program to fulfill the requirements of the RTCIP.

Each submittal was reviewed to ensure it allowed for collection of the minimum $2,000 per newly constructed residential housing unit and that those funds would be committed to improvements on the Regional Arterial System (RAS) as contained in the latest Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Although some jurisdictions submitted detailed information on an expenditure plan, this is not required until the first audit submittal on July 1, 2009. Mr. Stoll noted that this was not a SANDAG transportation impact fee but one put in place by each jurisdiction.

Mr. Stoll stated that SANDAG prepared a nexus study and staff held two workshops to discuss the nexus study and to explain the program. The nexus study was distributed in draft form and the report finalized based on the comments received. Mr. Stoll stated that there was some question regarding the fee of $2000 quoted in the ordinance and whether the amount of the fee should be adjusted for inflation of the 2002 dollars prior to July 1, 2008. After legal analysis, staff determined that the fee is $2,000 per residential unit beginning on July 1, 2008, and will be adjusted for inflation from that date forward. Mr. Stoll stated that in order to comply with the mitigation fee act the jurisdictions must provide a 60-day public notice period for any new fees to be put in place. In order to be able to respond to any comments or changes and remain in compliance, the draft funding programs are being presented to the ITOC, the Transportation Committee, and the Board of Directors this month.

Mr. Stoll highlighted some of the updates to the draft programs. The City Carlsbad had a first reading of its Ordinance and approval of the resolution on April 8, 2008, and the second reading took place on April 15, 2008, and was continued to April 22, 2008. The City of Del Mar did not approve its Ordinance and Resolution on April 7, 2008, but had the first reading of the Ordinance and approval of the resolution. The second reading and approval of the Ordinance is scheduled for April 21, 2008. The City of Lemon Grove approved its resolution on April 15, 2008. The City of San Diego approved its resolution on April 14, 2008, and the Mayor signed the resolution on April 15, 2008. The City of Vista approved a resolution tying its existing program to the RTCIP on April 8, 2008.

Michele Ann Mareck, representing Traffic Relief is Possible (TRIP), submitted written comments regarding the RTCIP funding programs and read them into the record. She spoke regarding two specific concerns regarding the fact that some of the fee submittals were for less than the established $2,000 per unit and how the jurisdictions are applying the inflation factor calculated by SANDAG.
Councilmember Hall stated that the City of Carlsbad had put forward two ordinances at the time of the first hearing and, after discussion the City Council chose to implement a more aggressive ordinance. He stated that the City may not meet the July 1, 2008, deadline. Councilmember Hall suggested there may be a delay until July 15, 2008, to implement the fee, and asked if the City would be in compliance as long as it did not issue permits between July 1, 2008, and July 15, 2008.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel stated that as long as no permits are issued until the impact fee is applicable, the City would be in compliance.

Councilmember Monroe requested that staff respond the Ms. Mareck’s comments.

Marney Cox, Chief Economist stated that inflation was built into the program and the nexus study provides that formula. Regardless, this is a choice for the each jurisdiction to use; it is not a requirement. The Ordinance only requires a $2,000 fee effective July 1, 2008.

Councilmember Monroe noted that two or three cities’ programs indicate fees less than the $2,000.

Mr. Cox stated that some cities have escalation clauses built in to their impact fee programs. Our requirement is for a minimum of an annual escalation of the $2,000 RTCIP fee but each jurisdiction has the choice on how to use the escalation clause within their programs. They do not have to apply the annual escalation to their other fees but will need to apply the escalator clause to the $2,000 fee at a minimum.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director stated that staff has no knowledge of any jurisdiction with a commitment of less than $2,000 per residential unit for the RTCIP.

Councilmember Monroe asked for clarification whether staff disagreed with the representation of the speaker (Ms. Mareck).

Mr. Cox replied in the affirmative. Staff has reviewed the submitted programs and based on their evaluation, every jurisdiction has a program adequate to charge the $2,000 fee. Some programs are already high enough that the jurisdiction and staff feel they charge sufficient amounts now to be in compliance with the ordinance. Other jurisdiction felt that no adjustments needed to be made as they would dedicate more of the current amounts collected to the Regional Arterial System. He stated that it is the choice of each local jurisdiction on how they spend the money they currently collect.

Ms. Wiley added that there was some discussion whether the general language at the beginning of the Ordinance that discusses adjustments for cost of living increases and the fact that the numbers are in 2002 dollars and whether that language applies to the RTCIP fee. The specific language of the Ordinance regarding the RTCIP funding program amount states that escalation will apply beginning July 1, 2009.

Mayor Druker commented that it was unfortunate that we are not charging development fees on commercial properties, specifically for transit and transportation purposes. He stated that if these commercial property fees had been in place there would be better connections for the COASTER.
Councilmember Monroe stated that the Board of Directors discussed this issue when developing TransNet and the Board felt that by implementing the fee for commercial properties, they would affect the same group paying the residential fee. Also, it was an essential element for garnering the support of the building industry for the ordinance.

Mayor Desmond stated that he felt the recommendation to approve the programs was out of his area of expertise and asked if the committee could accept the submittals instead of approve them and Ms. Wiley stated that the language of accept is adequate for the purposes of this committee.

Councilmember Hall commented that there was originally a proposed fee for commercial development but that it was a 400 percent increase that could not be fully supported.

Mayor Druker reiterated his belief that we need to charge for the services we provide and there is a lot of development occurring that is not paying its fair share.

Mayor Desmond asked if the language of the motion could be amended to say accept instead of approve.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the recommendation is for the Board of Directors to approve the programs; this Committee was not approving the programs.

Ms. Wiley stated that acceptance is fine for the purposes of the Transportation Committee.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Chairman Ed Gallo (NCTD), the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the attached Funding Program submittals from all 19 of the San Diego County jurisdictions to fulfill the RTCIP requirements within the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Commission Ordinance 04-01).

7. **REQUEST BY THE CITY OF NATIONAL CITY TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH SANDAG TO USE $4.5 MILLION IN SHORT-TERM DEBT THROUGH THE COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)**

Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager introduced the item. In accordance with Rule No. 16 of Board Policy No. 031, TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, local jurisdictions may access SANDAG’s Commercial Paper (CP) program to advance local TransNet eligible projects. Local jurisdictions must document their understanding of the requirements for using the TransNet Commercial Paper program in an executed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The City of National City has requested access to TransNet CP to undertake a major road resurfacing program in FY 2009.

The City of National City has determined that it cannot adequately address the need to resurface approximately 217 lane miles with annual revenues. In order to avoid higher repair costs in the future from continued deterioration and to take advantage of the current construction bid climate, National City has a planned $6.5 million street resurfacing program in FY 2009. Of this amount, the TransNet share would be $4.5 million. The City's TransNet revenues amount to approximately $1 million per year, and they are seeking additional debt financing through SANDAG’s CP program to keep up the resurfacing program and the integrity of the local transportation infrastructure. This
project will be included in the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, scheduled for approval in July 2008. At its meeting on April 1, 2008, the National City Council approved the request to borrow against its annual TransNet revenue for this purpose.

Ms. Kim stated that the ITOC reviewed the MOU at its April 9, 2008, meeting and it had no significant comments.

Maryam Babaki, City Engineer, City of National City commented that the City wanted to put in place a complete resurface program and accomplish the improvements at one time. The commercial paper program is the ideal program to fund the project. The City would borrow against its future TransNet revenues. It is important to get resurfacing done before the streets and roads decline to a point where repair would be at a significantly higher cost.

Chairman Gallo requested clarification that the City was borrowing money against future TransNet revenues and Ms. Kim stated that the debt service will come from National City’s share of TransNet and Ms. Babaki reiterated her understanding that they are borrowing against future TransNet revenues.

Mayor Art Madrid (East County) asked for clarification from National City whether this revenue was over and above the revenues anticipated from the RTCIP program. Ms. Babaki responded in the affirmative.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the use of the TransNet Commercial Paper program for the City of National City and authorize the Executive Director to execute the MOU.

8. STATUS OF TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AUDITS (RECOMMEND)

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Associate Financial Analyst presented the item. The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires the setting of new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) levels.

At this time, the recommendation is to proceed with the approval of the MOE base level for the City of San Diego so that they are able to use the information in their FY 2009 budget development process.

Section 8 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance prescribes the requirement to develop a new MOE level, based on the level of discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the fiscal years 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003. The MOE level will then be subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans, not to exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction’s general fund revenues over the same time period.

Last February, the ITOC reviewed and commented on the set of procedures that were proposed to be used by SANDAG’s auditors, Caporicci & Larson (C&L), to perform the MOE audits. Since that time, the audits have been underway and are now complete. The result of the procedures is a new MOE base that will then be applied in fiscal year 2009, which is the first year the requirements under the TransNet Extension Ordinance will apply.
On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors approved the MOE base levels for the Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, and Vista, and the County of San Diego. On March 28, 2008, the Board of Directors approved the MOE base levels for the Cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Oceanside. However, we received notice from the City of Del Mar that it would like to review its base year expenditures to determine if it had any one-time expenditures during that period and, depending on the outcome, we may be back to re-approve its base MOE.

The City of San Diego audit is ready for approval. With the potential exception of the City of Del Mar noted above, this will conclude the process of setting the MOE base levels for all the jurisdictions under the TransNet Extension.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Mayor Desmond, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the City of San Diego MOE base level.

9. 2006 RTIP AMENDMENT FOR PROPOSITION 1B TRADE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND PROJECTS (RECOMMEND)

Mr. Stoll presented the item. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) released staff recommendations for programming the Proposition 1B Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) at its March 2008 meeting. The CTC has proposed to program approximately $3 billion, including the $2 billion Proposition 1B funds plus other state and future goods movement funds, to improve goods movement corridors focusing in four key areas of the state, including the San Diego border region. CTC staff recommendations include programming $400 million in TCIF funds for San Diego region highway, rail, and maritime projects. The $400 million in TCIF is proposed to be matched by approximately $33.4 million in TransNet funds to help leverage over $1.2 billion in goods movement improvements across three modes in the region. The CTC adopted the TCIF program at its April 9-10, 2008, meeting. Funding for the TCIF program will be subject to appropriation by the Legislature in the state budget.

Mr. Stoll stated that SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP generally on a quarterly basis and occasionally on a more frequent basis as circumstances arise. This proposed amendment would program TCIF projects for which SANDAG is the lead agency and that are in need of TransNet as the local match. Staff will work with the lead agencies for the port and border projects to include them in the 2008 RTIP update.

Mr. Stoll provided an overview of the TCIF development process in which the region has participated. Mr. Stoll provided a description of the four major goods movement corridors in the state and the TCIF candidate projects for the San Diego border region. All projects proposed will be under construction by 2013. Staff worked with all jurisdictions in the region to develop a San Diego Regional Goods Movement Action Plan (GMAP) and included it in the 2030 RTP. SANDAG led a multi-agency consultation to develop the list of projects based on the GMAP and potential investment levels. Mr. Stoll reviewed the project investment levels based on the recent approval by the CTC of $400 million.
Mr. Stoll discussed the economic impacts to the region from each of the candidate projects and stated that staff ensured that the candidate projects met the intent of the voter, the legislature, and the CTC, and that there was a regional consensus on the projects.

Mr. Stoll reviewed the projects and discussed how each project was responsive to the CTC screening criteria. One of the screening criteria for eligibility was matching funds dollar for dollar, but the border projects were exempt from that requirement. Mr. Stoll reviewed the funding sources for each project including the amount of TCIF funds, TransNet funds, and other funds required. Funds will be taken from the Border Access Improvements and the I-5 Corridor funds. The funding decision includes an RTIP amendment in order to meet timelines for the SR 905 project advertisement for bid.

Mr. Stoll reviewed the currently approved TransNet Plan of Finance and stated that the ITOC reviewed the proposal and requested that staff report the impact of this action to the Plan of Finance. Mr. Stoll stated that the impact is very minimal and reviewed the impact.

Clive Richard, a member of the public, stated that our region did well with receiving the Proposition 1B TCIF funds and stated he felt is was due to the fact that this region had good projects that were ready to go and worth doing. He stated his support of the action.

Councilmember Monroe asked if this money was allotted or whether it still had to go through the assembly or other approval steps.

Mr. Gallegos stated that this program requires annual appropriations. The legislature can’t change the allocations the CTC approved but the program still would need appropriations annually. Those projects that meet criteria for construction will most likely compete very well for appropriations. We have been working with other regions and most are satisfied with their allocations. We expect that annually the allocation will go through appropriations as approved by the CTC, with no changes to the allocations.

Councilmember Hall asked for more details on how much money was allocated from the I-5 Corridor funds to the transit portion and how much was allocated to highways.

Mr. Stoll stated that the I-5 Corridor is listed as Project 31 in the TransNet Ordinance and although he did not know the exact number Mr. Stoll stated that the entire corridor funding is well in excess of $1 billion.

Chairman Gallo expressed his appreciation to Mr. Gallegos and staff for their work on getting this funding and stated that we need to get the legislators in Sacramento to recognize our need for transit funding.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we are continuing to meet with the legislators and push for funding for transit in our region. Our two state senators are working hard to avoid taking money from transit and they know what our difficulties are and are working hard to keep the funds for transit allocated in the state budget.

Mayor Druker referred to the list of recommended projects and sources of funds and asked for clarification of the sources for other funds, specifically for the LOSSAN rail project.
Mr. Gallegos stated that funding for the SR 11 and East Otay Mesa Border Crossing project would come in part from tolls. SANDAG is sponsoring legislation that if approved would fund that project in part. Also, SANDAG has a dollar for dollar match from the Port of San Diego for funding of the two Port projects.

Mr. Stoll stated that the $2.1 million shown as “other” funds for the double track project is actually programmed STIP dollars for the rail corridor.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) stated that she met with Senators Ducheny and Kehoe and they both understand the need for funding in the region. We need to continue to collectively push for our region on a regular basis.

Mr. Paul Jablonski (MTS) asked for clarification regarding the TransNet funds for the South Line and whether those funds are coming out of the Blue Line/Orange Line Rehabilitation project.

Mr. Gallegos stated that those are funds from the Border Access Fund and the South Line is considered a border access project. The bond dollars can only be used for construction purposes so the Border Access funds will allow us to finalize plans, acquire land, and other nonconstruction purposes.

Mr. Jablonski stated that the infusion of dollars into the Blue Line will ultimately help with improvements and rehabilitation to that line not only for transit but for freight.

Mr. Gallegos stated that this will improve both transit and freight. This is a goods movement piece and we are hoping to leverage TransNet dollars for the Blue Line with the bond dollars.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors (1) approve programming of $33.425 million of TransNet funds from the Border Access Improvements and the Interstate 5 Corridor within the TransNet Major Corridor Improvement program; and (2) adopt Resolution No. 2008-24 approving Amendment No. 14 to the 2006 RTIP.

10. INTERSTATE 15 CORRIDOR UPDATE (RECOMMEND)

Gustavo Dallarda, Caltrans Corridor Project Director. Caltrans and SANDAG are jointly developing the Interstate 15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit (I-15 ML/BRT) project included in the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) authorized by the SANDAG Board of Directors in January 2005. This project includes construction of four managed lanes, operational improvements, implementation of the region’s first BRT service, and expansion of the existing FasTrak® system. He reviewed the three segments of the project: north segment, middle segment, and south segment, and the current status of each project and anticipated progress in the next six months. He commented that Caltrans received 10 bids for the landscaping portion of the middle segment and they were 26 percent lower than the engineer’s estimate. Mr. Dallarda reviewed the status of repairs to the project due to damages from the wildfires.
Mr. Dallarda presented two cost savings proposals. He stated that Flatiron Construction Corp. has proposed to advance the excavation of 50,000 cubic meters (m³) of fill material from the I-15 North Segment to use as backfill on the Middle Segment at the Rancho Bernardo Transit Station. Since the quantity of excavation exceeds the need for the I-15 North Segment, this material would be exported offsite as part of the North Segment at a significantly higher cost, estimated at $25 per cubic meter. Staff is requesting a transfer of funds in the amount of $550,000 from the North Segment to the Middle Segment to avoid a future cost increase on the North Segment. This work includes excavation, haul, traffic control, erosion control, and other necessary measures.

In addition, the North Segment scope of work includes constructing automatic traffic channelizers, in-pavement lights, a gantry, and fiber network in the Middle Segment area to assist with traffic control for the managed lanes system and to support the FasTrak infrastructure when the North Segment is opened to traffic. Staff recommends the advancement of this work by transferring the scope to the Middle Segment to allow these elements to be constructed more efficiently while the Middle Segment pavement and bridge at Del Lago are being constructed. Staff is requesting a transfer of funds in the amount of $1,350,000 for this work.

A total transfer of $1.9 million from the I-15 North CIP (No. 1201503) to the I-15 Middle CIP (No. 1201502) is requested to support these items of work. The total Corridor budget would remain unchanged at $1.3 billion. The transfer of funds will be reflected in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program at the earliest opportunity. However, in the interest of time, it is proposed to use these funds in accordance with this report upon the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors actions. The ITOC recommended approval of this transfer.

Chair Pro Tem Emery requested a presentation to his City Council of an overview of the entire I-15 project excluding the request for transfer of funds.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve a transfer of funds in the amount of $1.9 million from the I-15 North Segment (CIP No. 1201503) to the I-15 Middle Segment (CIP No. 1201502). The total Corridor budget would remain unchanged at $1.3 billion. The transfer of funds will be reflected in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program at the earliest opportunity. However, in the interest of time, by approving this transfer, the Transportation Committee consents to the use of these funds henceforth as described in this report.

11. ESCONDIDO RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (ADOPT)

Linda Culp, Senior Regional Planner presented the item and reviewed the project. The project is included in the 2030 RTP and is part of the network of rail, BRT, arterial rapid, local bus services that provide low cost capital priority measures as required by the RTP.
The Escondido Rapid Transit Project replaces the Route 350, a local bus route operated by NCTD, which will improve the route’s performance, reliability, travel time, and ridership by implementing a number of transit priority measures and other improvements. The project is a coordinated effort among SANDAG, NCTD, and the City of Escondido. The Route 350 runs from the Escondido Transit Center to Westfield Shoppingtown North County via Valley Parkway, Escondido Boulevard, Sunset Drive, and Bear Valley Parkway. When improvements are complete, the route will terminate at the new Del Lago BRT station, currently under construction as part of the I-15 Managed Lanes/BRT project.

This project represents the region’s first “rapid bus” service and will feature distinctive branding of buses and bus stops, transit signal priority, transit queue jumper lanes at congested intersections, digital “next bus” information signs at stops, and pedestrian improvements. The project will improve a key north inland connection with the SPRINTER, future I-15 BRT, and other regional transit services.

A draft Environmental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The draft IS/MND describes the project, overviews the environmental analysis performed, and provides a determination of the effect on the environment. A 30-day public review and comment period was completed on March 17, 2008. Comments were received and staff has prepared responses.

The Escondido Rapid Bus project is a six-mile existing local bus corridor within the City of Escondido and portions of the County of San Diego (Attachment 1). Fifteen-minute service currently operates on the route, which runs from the Escondido Transit Center to Westfield Shoppingtown North County via Valley Parkway, Escondido Boulevard, Sunset Drive, and Bear Valley Parkway. Currently, the route is very popular, with more than 2,400 boardings each weekday. The route suffers from general traffic congestion and heavy school boardings in the south portion of the corridor during peak periods.

The proposed key elements of the project are: improved bus stops, transit signal priority, queue jumper lanes, traffic signal modifications, pedestrian improvements, and distinctive bus wraps. Ms. Culp reviewed details for how the queue jumper and signal priority programs would work. Also, she provided design concepts for the improved bus stops. Ms. Culp also provided visuals of the distinctive bus wraps and branding.

The draft IS/MND outlines and evaluates 17 specific environmental issue areas relevant to the project. The draft environmental IS/MND was circulated to relevant state agencies, as well as several local agencies, organizations, and business and residences along the corridor for a 30-day review period.

Staff has prepared responses to all comments received which were included in the information provided to the members. A total of four agencies/individuals provided comments during the public review and comment period. A particular area of focus for public outreach was the businesses and residences along the proposed queue jump component at Valley Parkway and Centre City Parkways, and a public meeting was held on March 10, 2008, at the City of Escondido.
Ms. Culp stated that the four comments received were from Caltrans, the Native American Heritage Commission, the San Diego Archaeological Society, and the City of Escondido. After reviewing the comments and preparing responses, the conclusion of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

Ms. Culp reviewed the project schedule and stated that design and engineering will be completed in late summer 2008. Construction is scheduled to begin this fall, with the start of operations scheduled for late 2008/early 2009. NCTD will continue to operate the service.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo asked if SANDAG was working with the County on its portion of the road and widening of Sunset Drive.

Ms. Culp stated that there were two physical improvements planned for Sunset Drive. One is the queue jumper lane turning left onto Sunset and the other is the widening. We would work with the County on these two projects.

Karen King (NCTD) commented that both SANDAG and City of Escondido staff were instrumental in getting this project moving forward. She asked what the cost estimate was for the bus station improvements per stop. Ms. Culp stated that we do not have a final design and are still working on details like the solar panels, but the estimate is approximately $70,000 per single shelter.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond and a second by Chair Pro Tem Emery, the Transportation Committee adopted the Final Environmental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Escondido Rapid Bus Project after consideration of the comments received during the public review period and responses for the Draft Environmental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

12. **SORRENTO VALLEY COASTER CONNECTION SERVICES FUNDING UPDATE (DISCUSSION)**

Dave Schumacher, Principal Regional Planner presented the item and reviewed the current COASTER connection routes. The MTS has provided connecting service to employment centers in and around the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station for COASTER riders since 1997. Since its inception, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) provided a significant portion of the funding necessary to subsidize the service. Recently, Caltrans mitigation funds from the Interstate 5/Interstate 805 (I-5/I-805) construction project have also been used. In FY 2008, these two sources provided a total of $731,858 for the COASTER Connection services, representing 64 percent of the total $1.138 million budget. APCD has indicated that continued funding is unlikely beyond June 30, 2008, and the Caltrans mitigation funds are a one-time funding source that ends this fiscal year.

At the November 16, 2007, Transportation Committee meeting, staff noted the importance that the COASTER Connection services provide for the nearly 1,000 daily riders that work in the areas served by the service. As a result, SANDAG staff has been working closely with MTS, NCTD, and the employers in the area to examine potential ways to offset this loss in revenue. This item outlines a proposed strategy for discussion by the Transportation Committee.
Mr. Schumacher stated that nine COASTER Connection routes operated by MTS connect to job centers in the Sorrento Valley, Sorrento Mesa, University City, and Torrey Pines. Ridership is strong, with approximately 980 daily riders per day. Because the services are geared solely for COASTER riders, timed connections are provided to COASTER trains, making for convenient transfers.

A separate fare is currently not charged for COASTER Connection riders. NCTD does allocate 5 percent of the COASTER revenues ($320,000 in FY 2008) for connecting MTS services at Sorrento Valley, Old Town, and Santa Fe Depot. A portion of these monies ($103,500) is allocated by MTS to the COASTER Connection services.

Mr. Schumacher stated that based on discussion with MTS, NCTD, and employers in the Sorrento Valley/University City area, a two-phased strategy is outlined below for addressing the COASTER Connection funding issue. The strategy is based on the following premises:

- Providing transit options for workers in and around the Sorrento Valley area is critical to the regional transportation system, and access from the Sorrento Valley COASTER station is an important link in this system.

- Developing a long-term solution that provides sustainable funding for the COASTER Connections services is needed given that operating budget problems faced by MTS and NCTD are likely to continue into the foreseeable future.

- Exploring possible options other than conventional transit service is more likely to lead to a long-term sustainable solution.

Mr. Schumacher stated that Phase I is the interim continuation of the COASTER services. Given the short timeframe until the end of the fiscal year when APCD and Caltrans funds are no longer available, interim funding to continue the existing COASTER Connection services operated by MTS is needed until the longer-term solution outlined in Phase 2 can be implemented. A review of available funding resources shows there are limited options available for continuing the service, and that these options are one-time funding sources that could keep the COASTER Connection services operational for one additional year at best.

MTS currently provides $300,000 in MTS area Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding and, as noted above, allocates a portion of the COASTER revenue sharing funds ($103,500). The only other potential funding source available is the federal Jobs Access, Reverse Commute (JARC) program. While only $57,000 remain unallocated in the urban area JARC funding that SANDAG awards, MTS has applied for rural JARC funding allocated by Caltrans for Route 905 that operates partially in rural areas as defined by the JARC program. Since Route 905 was awarded urban area JARC funds in the recent SANDAG competitive process, receipt of the rural JARC funds could free up urban area JARC monies that could be applied to the COASTER Connection services. Indications are favorable for securing upwards of $380,000 in rural JARC funding for Route 905. Given the local match requirements for JARC from nonfare revenue sources, a maximum of $300,000 in JARC monies could then be applied towards the COASTER Connection services.

Assuming these funds continue, the FY 2009 budget for the COASTER Connection services shows that these sources would total just over $700,000, leaving a balance of about $350,000 based on MTS’ estimate for FY 2009 operating costs ($1,050,000). Short of service cutbacks in other MTS and
NCTD services, the only way to make up this balance is to increase COASTER and/or COASTER Connection fares. While ridership productivity on the COASTER Connection services is strong and compares favorably with other routes in the MTS and NCTD systems, the farebox recovery rate in FY 2009 would only represent 9.8 percent given the fact that there is no direct fare charged for COASTER Connection users other than the COASTER revenue sharing monies. This figure is significantly less than the MTS systemwide average of about 33 percent. With potential service cutbacks by MTS and NCTD due to declining state revenues for public transportation and flat sales tax revenues that make up the TDA funds, it becomes imperative that the COASTER Connection services achieve at or near the MTS systemwide farebox recovery rate average. Implementing a $1.00 each way fare for the COASTER Connection would generate sufficient revenues to bring the farebox recovery rate up to the system average.

A $1.00 each way fare would equate to $40.00 per month for riders using the COASTER Connection services each weekday. COASTER passengers would have the option of purchasing a $40.00 per month supplement to a monthly COASTER pass or purchasing a new COASTER Day Pass (price to be determined). The new Compass Card would also be made available to make payment for COASTER and COASTER Connection services easy and convenient.

The $1.00 fare increase would generate significant new revenue (about $194,000 annually), but would still leave an FY 2009 unfunded balance of $152,500 for a full year operation. While the fare for the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection could be raised higher than the proposed $1.00 each way, it is unlikely that the budget could be balanced since any additional revenues would be offset by expected ridership losses from a higher fare. The result is that sufficient revenues would be available only to cover a nine-month operation (July 2008 through March 2009), meaning that the long-term solution outlined in the next section would need to be implemented no later than April 2009. Mr. Schumacher reviewed the estimated costs, assumptions, and budget for FY 2009.

Mr. Schumacher stated that Phase 2 is the long-term solution and needs to be in place by April 2009. In meetings with employer groups in the Sorrento Mesa/University City area, staff learned that there are a number of private shuttles operated by employers that shuttle employees between their various office parks. Some of these shuttles are already used to access the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station during the morning and afternoon commute. In addition, there are numerous vanpools that serve the area which are subsidized by the RideLink vanpool program. These shuttles and vanpools represent opportunities for developing public-private solutions to serve COASTER riders accessing the Sorrento Valley station. Carsharing station cars and short-distance vanpools are additional solutions that could potentially fill the gap between the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station and employment centers in the vicinity. Such programs exist in other office parks throughout the country. Our aim, therefore, is to explore how to tap these ideas to tailor a solution that maximizes utilization of resources already available while minimizing public funds needed to support the current COASTER Connection services.

Mr. Schumacher stated that SANDAG staff will begin work immediately with the employers in the Sorrento Valley/University City area to undertake a survey of employee and employer impressions of the COASTER Connection services and solicit ideas on possible solutions. Additionally, staff will survey the riders for their input. From there, a set of alternative service options can be developed and evaluated. Between now and April 2009, staff will report back to the Transportation Committee on progress towards developing the long-term strategy.
In addition, staff will initiate the process for amending the SANDAG fare ordinance, including setting dates for public hearings. At this point, it is assumed that the COASTER Connection fare would be implemented in September 2008.

Mayor Druker commented that this service is very important to the area. He stated that we need to look at a potential increase in vehicle registration fees to help fund this corridor and that the implementation of the compass card is essential when this fee increase is put in place. Mayor Druker stated that there needs to be some type of additional capital improvements in the area to improve ease of using the service such as gondolas to take people up the hill. He commented that we need to get people directly to that train station without them having to use the bus.

Chair Pro Tem Emery commented that this is the perfect area where all forms of transit come together. It is imperative that we continue to have a service there and these innovative ideas to continue funding for the next year are essential. We need to look at a three phase solution. The first phase would be the types of solutions presented today such as cooperative vanpools to continue the service for the short-term. The second phase would be developing public private partnerships, and the third phase would be long-term capital improvements. We must be aggressive to find funds to support this service. MTS has never been able to fund adequate transit systems in this area and we need to find a secondary method of funding such as public private partnerships.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo referenced the $320,000 of funds that NCTD contributes to MTS for the Sorrento Valley connection found in paragraph four on page one and stated that it was the opinion of the NCTD Board of Directors that the revenue from the COASTER should be applied to subsidize the Sorrento Valley connection as the only service that connects the COASTER to the employment centers. The full amount of $320,000 should be applied to the COASTER connection services as opposed to allocating funds towards the Old Town Trolley and downtown.

Chair Pro Tem asked whether the APCD had submitted anything in writing stating that it would no longer contribute funding. Mr. Gallegos stated at the time of the most recent application for these funds, the APCD informed us that it would no longer fund this project. Mr. Gallegos, on behalf of SANDAG along with NCTD and MTS, sent a letter to APCD in response but every indication is that it does not have the funds to commit to this program. He stated that APCD staff has indicated that the $2.00 fee it currently collects is only enough to fund the reporting and monitoring.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo stated that the purpose of the $2.00 fee was to cover this program. He then referenced the second bullet on page two regarding developing long-term solution and stated that once again that although we have known for a long time that we need to do something, once again we wait until the last minute. Chair Pro Tem commented that in one aspect staff refers to this service as different and that it should not compete with other MTS services for dollars but then staff states that the farebox recovery ratio should reflect the MTS system average. He stated that the COASTER revenues given to MTS should be included in the calculation of the farebox recovery ratio. He stated that it is probably reasonable to have a surcharge for the Sorrento Valley COASTER. He stated that the COASTER is a regional service and should have a regional solution. While the COASTER riders are predominantly north county residents, they work for employers in San Diego. They pay sales tax in the City of San Diego which is why it is appropriate for MTS to use some of their TDA funds to serve them. We take people where they need to go not where they reside. Chair Pro Tem asked for clarification of why the date of April, 2009, was selected as the date to find a solution to fund the Sorrento Valley connection.
Mr. Gallegos stated that it is all financial. If we put the surcharge in place, those additional revenues will help fund the service for the next nine months, which is from July 2008 through April 2009.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo stated that the solution needs to be developed a lot sooner than that to ensure the continuity of service. We can’t afford to lose riders. Once riders are lost it is difficult to get those passengers back. Chair Pro Tem Gallo recommended that all transit riders contact their legislators and urge that the state find some other way to balance the budget other than by taking funds away from transit.

Councilmember Monroe commented that we need to figure out how to keep this service. He commentated that he rides the COASTER north to attend FACT meetings and that he is very impressed with the service. The COASTER connection is not just a single service. There are several vans at each of the stops providing vanpool services. He requested staff to provide a rider count for those vans. We should look at the numbers and see if they are being efficient. Councilmember Monroe commented that he was impressed with the programs that recently received the Diamond Awards from SANDAG. These companies instigated programs that worked on congestion relief such as funding transit passes for employees. He stated that that he did not think that all companies in the area know about these types of programs and how SANDAG encourages them. He stated that SANDAG needs to advertise the Diamond Award program so that more companies will participate.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) asked for clarification on the total amount of subsidy to continue the service.

Mr. Schumacher reviewed the operating budget for FY 2009 and the operating costs are a little over $1 million and the COASTER connection fare is approximately $200,000.

Councilmember Rindone asked what the subsidy per passenger, per trip is for the service and stated that he thought it was around $4.00 or $5.00, and Mr. Schumacher stated that he would provide that at a later date.

Mr. Gallegos stated that to fund the program, there is a need to charge approximately $4 per day, per passenger and Councilmember Rindone stated that we need to look at all options and to do that, we need to know the total amount of funding needed.

Mr. Jablonski stated that the subsidy is roughly is $8.00 per day, per passenger, and given the uncertainty of the exact amount, Mr. Gallegos stated that staff would provide the exact subsidy at another meeting.

Councilmember Rindone stated that to look for solutions we need to know the size of the problem. He requested that the public hearings for this issue, be held time specific.

Councilmember Atkins commented that we need to work with employers and requested staff to provide more details on how SANDAG plans to do that. She requested staff provide the subsidy amount prior to the start of the public hearings so we know what needs to be done based on the required funding and the shortfall. She stated that this service is important for the overall regional transit system.
Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) commented that this service is important but that it is a very expensive subsidy. He commented that this subsidy of $8.00 per person, per mile might be the highest in the whole system. He commented that the mission of the APCD is to fund programs that clean the air and this program does not support that mission.

Ms. King commented that this action today is two part and we need to keep those two actions separate. The first part is how do we keep the service running beyond June and then, how do we fund this service long-term. Ms. King commented that we continue to find one-time funds to support this service but we have not identified a long-term solution. She commented that the staff report stated that staff will report back to the Committee by April on their recommendation for a long-term solution and she urged staff to meet that deadline. Ms. King stated that part of the subsidy per passenger is based on the service design and we should perhaps look at how to modify the service design to make it less costly. Ms. King stated her support for the dollar fee but that it impacts how NCTD or this Committee sets fares on the COASTER and the ability to recover costs. Also, MTS made improvements at that station a number of years ago but had to scale back the project due to insufficient funding and stated that we should look at how those improvements might help to solve the current issues by perhaps expanding the station car program. Ms. King also stated that we need to consider what the riders need and stated her support in polling the passengers to get their ideas as well. Ms. King commented that staff is proposing a $40 supplemental pass and asked how these passes would be made available to the riders, what type of fare media would be implemented, and what would be the potential cost of modifying ticket machines to issue these passes.

James Driesbach-Towle, Systems Integration stated that SANDAG plans to issue Compass Card in time to support this program and the cost to reprogram the ticket machines would be approximately $2,000 in programming charges and a funding source has not been identified.

Mayor Druker commented that NCTD has removed almost all COASTER connections due to low farebox collections. The only major ridership for the COASTER connection is at Sorrento Valley. Mayor Druker commented that 90 percent of the employers in Sorrento Valley have fewer than 100 employees and it will be difficult to get them to participate in sponsoring this funding program.

Mr. Gallegos stated we have been talking to these employers and have found that there are duplicative services in this area. He stated that is an opportunity for public private partnerships to work together to provide van service to more than one companies’ employees.

Councilmember Monroe commented that he was referring to this COASTER connection only and would like information and data on the route from downtown to Oceanside. Councilmember Monroe addressed Chair Pro Tem Gallo’s comments from the NCTD Board meeting and requested clarification as to what would cause NCTD to make these comments regarding the allocation of the COASTER revenues.

Chair Pro Tem Gallo stated that NCTD contributes $320,000 per year to MTS for the COASTER connection services. However, those funds are not allocated to the COASTER connection but are split three ways. The NCTD Board feels that if NCTD is contributing $320,000 for COASTER connection services, then that is where the money should be allocated.
Clive Richard, a member of the public, commented that this issue wouldn’t be here if there was only one transit agency and stated that he would like to see the issue resolved. He commented that the transit route he uses is being cut and the subsidy for it is much less.

Mr. Jablonski stated that the COASTER funding of $320,000 was generated based on passenger count for those that transfer at the Old Town station and America Plaza; for passengers that transfer from NCTD services to MTS services. He stated that this whole issue is because of the overall loss of funding and the need for cuts in services. Mr. Jablonski stated that it is unfortunate and MTS wants to continue the service because it recognizes its importance. MTS plans to continue funding the $300,000 in TDA.

Vice Chair Dale asked staff why we don’t charge a surcharge of more than $1.00 each way to make up the shortfall and Mr. Schumacher stated that the goal is not to increase the fare too much and potentially lose too much ridership. Staff recognizes that there is a need for a nontransit solution such as shuttles and station cars to minimize the impact to the current passengers.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff will poll riders to determine if they are willing to pay for the service and how much they are willing to pay to continue this service.

Ms. King commented that she would encourage staff to think differently about this service as they go forward. It is very different type of service as others provided in the region. She stated that we should consider only providing as much service as we have the ability to fund. Raising fares to cover existing service may not be the only solution and she urged staff to work with the users of the service to help solve the problem.

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

13. **SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (INFORMATION)**

Jim Linthicum, Division Director presented an update on the status of the SPRINTER project and the SANDAG independent assessment.

Revenue service began on March 9, 2008. Daily ridership grew each week peaking at 7,800 in late March. Ridership dropped to 6,500 during the first week of April; it is believed this decrease is due to students on spring break.

All 15 stations are open to the public; however, the Nordahl Station parking lot and the eastbound platform at the Escondido Avenue Station are not yet complete. Subsurface conditions and this past winter’s rainstorms substantially delayed the parking lot work. Currently the contractor is placing concrete curb and gutters. The parking lot should be open for public use in June.

The eastbound platform at Escondido Avenue is on the inside of a curved section of track requiring the installation of a deployable plate to close the gap between platform and the vehicle prior to passenger boarding. The plates and electrical equipment are being manufactured. Partial installation and a demonstration of the system to the California Public Utilities Commission are scheduled for later this month.
Work on stormwater control measures, landscaping, and punch list items will continue through this spring. The contractor’s progress schedule shows completion of all work in June.

On December 31, 2007, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board issued a Clean Up and Abatement Order directing NCTD to improve its construction stormwater control measures. In response, NCTD committed to have the entire corridor fully compliant by May 1, 2008. As of early April, half of the corridor is compliant and the other half should be ready by the May 1 deadline. To accomplish this, NCTD has brought in a new contractor to supplement its Mainline contractor’s placement of the stormwater control measures. Note, the Regional Board has not commented on neither NCTD’s compliance plan nor has the Regional Board expressed its opinion on the installation of the new measures.

NCTD has not calculated a new estimate at completion (EAC); therefore the final projected cost remains $478.3 million. Before issuing a new EAC, NCTD wants a better estimate of credits to the contract in addition to reducing the backlog of outstanding change orders. A new estimate is expected in late April.

The $478.3 million includes a $7.8 million contingency and assumes NCTD will pay the maximum potential value of the settlement agreement with the Mainline contractor. It also includes a forecasted cost for 179 change orders yet to be negotiated. The project budget set by the NCTD Board, and included in the Amended Recovery Plan for the FTA, is $484.1 million, giving NCTD an additional $5.8 million of capacity between budget and EAC. Total available funds are $13.6 million.

In the settlement agreement, NCTD agreed to pay the contractor up to $3.3 million for constructive acceleration should it meet agreed upon internal milestones. The milestones proved to be too aggressive for the contractor and no payments were made. The agreement also provided for payment of the contractor’s damages due to the design changes through spring 2007. The payment was capped at $12.2 million and required the contractor to provide suitable backup of actual costs. To date the contractor has been paid $5.3 million of this amount.

The risks to budget continue to be the backlog of change orders, the cost of the additional stormwater control measures, and the impacts from the delay to the start of revenue service.

Councilmember Monroe stated that at a recent Bayshore Bikeway Committee meeting there was discussion regarding the inland rail trail that is being constructed along the SPRINTER line. There was some concern that some of the landscaping for the SPRINTER is being charged to the Bayshore Bikeway.

Mr. Linthicum stated that the inland rail trail was built concurrently with the SPRINTER by the Mainline contractor. Because there is still a backlog of outstanding change orders and quantities to be calculated, they can’t determine the final cost of the inland rail trail until they know the final cost of the SPRINTER mainline. The project manager for the inland rail trail is treating this as fairly as possible. The project manager must determine what the cost of the SPRINTER would be if the inland rail trail had not been built concurrently, for example, if a retaining wall had to be built solely due to inland rail trail then the inland rail trail assumes the cost of that retaining wall. The same applies to all aspects of the project that are due solely to the inland rail trail. This can’t be calculated until we know the final cost of the Mainline project.
Councilmember Monroe commented that the costs that are now being projected for the inland rail trail based on that analysis are not funded in the Bayshore Bikeway project.

Mr. Linthicum stated that they are also concerned about the costs but the inland rail trail project is completed and now we can only work to make sure that only its fair share of the budget are attributed to that portion of the SPRINTER project.

Councilmember Monroe stated that regardless of the actual cost, there is no money funded or allocated to cover the cost and Mr. Linthicum stated that he believes that staff will be requesting additional funding for the Inland Rail Trail soon.

Mr. Gallegos stated that staff is very aware of the need to provide a final accounting of the cost of the inland rail trail but by building the project in conjunction with the SPRINTER we were able to build a very important project that otherwise might not have been affordable in the future as a stand alone project.

Councilmember Monroe expressed his concerns regarding the lack of funding sources for the Bayshore Bikeway. He stated that the Bayshore Bikeway project has been fighting for funding for many years and now, when faced with potentially high costs for the inland rail trail, it seems that funding can be found. He stated that he did not remember setting this project as a priority.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

14. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for May 2, 2008, at 9 a.m.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 11:26 a.m.
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<td>Ramona Finnila</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Albert Phoenix</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Shane Chapparosa</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

May 2, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

AUTOMATED FARE COLLECTION – MTS FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND BUDGET AMENDMENT

File Number 1145700

Introduction

Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) has requested SANDAG to procure additional fareboxes through the SANDAG contract with GFI Genfare as part of the Automated Fare Collection (AFC) Project.

Discussion

The SANDAG AFC project is facilitating the design, procurement, and installation of new fare collection equipment for the region’s transit operators. The vision for the project is to implement a unified fare collection system and deploy the Compass Card, which will make payment of transit fares easier and more convenient.

MTS has requested that SANDAG execute an amendment to the existing SANDAG contract with GFI Genfare for the procurement of additional fare collection equipment to be used by MTS Contract Bus service. The equipment being procured must be compatible with the existing equipment being used at MTS in order to enhance MTS’ ability to effectively collect and secure bus revenue and support the Compass Card.

The MOU states that MTS will transfer $340,000 in funds to SANDAG for the cost of the effort and that SANDAG will perform the functions of contract and project management. The MTS Board of Directors approved the amendment at its April 24, 2008, meeting. This funding would be programmed into the AFC capital project budget.

JACK BODA
Departmental Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. MTS Agenda Item No. 32, 4/24/08, MTS Farebox Support Equipment - SANDAG MOU and Fund Transfer

Key Staff Contact: James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, jdr@sandag.org
JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
for the Metropolitan Transit System,
San Diego Transit Corporation, and San Diego Trolley, Inc.

April 24, 2008

SUBJECT:

MTS: FAREBOX SUPPORT EQUIPMENT - SANDAG MOU AND FUND TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

1. execute a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and MTS to transfer capital project funds for fare box support equipment (in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment A); and

2. transfer funds from various MTS projects to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 11198 (MTS Contract Services MTS Contract Services SBMF Miscellaneous Equipment) for fare box support equipment (see Attachment B).

Budget Impact

The proposed MOU would transfer up to $340,000 from MCS SBMF Miscellaneous Equipment (CIP 11198) to SANDAG to purchase fare box support equipment under SANDAG CIP 1145700 (Automatic Fare Collection). Funds in the amount of $174,845 would be transferred from five MTS projects to MCS SBMF Miscellaneous Equipment (CIP 11198) as follows:

1. Chula Vista Bus Stop Facilities (CIP 11146) - $48,408
2. Chula Vista Transit Bus Stop Security Improvements (CIP 11187) - $49,001
3. Bus Stop Safety & Security Enhancements (CIP 11235) - $30,000
4. MCS Bus Stop Program (CIP 11233) - $32,516
5. MCS Service Trucks – East County Maintenance (CIP 11197) - $14,919
DISCUSSION:

MTS staff is requesting authorization to use CIP funds to purchase support equipment for MTS fare box systems. SANDAG is willing to purchase the support equipment under the existing GFI Genfare agreement CIP 1145700 (SANDAG Automatic Fare Collection Project), which would allow the equipment to be purchased utilizing pricing within an existing agreement. An MOU (Attachment A) has been developed that would allow SANDAG to utilize MTS grant funds to purchase the equipment for MTS.

The equipment would be used to support the automation of the fare box revenue collection at MTS Contract Services locations at South Bay Division (3650A Main Street in Chula Vista), East County Division (1213 North Johnson Avenue in El Cajon), and Chula Vista Transit (1800 Maxwell Drive in Chula Vista).

Transfer of Project Funds

In order to provide sufficient funding for fare box support equipment, staff reviewed several capital projects and determined that additional funding could be transferred to the MTS Contract Services SBMF Miscellaneous Equipment Project. Attachment B summarizes the fund transfers. Some of the projects were MTS projects for Chula Vista Transit bus stop improvements. Chula Vista staff concurs with the recommended funding transfers and has approved the funding transfers that can be used for the MTS fare box support equipment. Some of the equipment would be used to outfit the Chula Vista Maxwell Yard Division with automated fare box equipment and garage systems hardware and software for fare box system management for the Chula Vista Transit buses.

Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Susan Hafner, 619.595.3084, Susan.Hafner@sdmts.com

Attachments: A. Draft MOU
               B. Summary of Project Fund Transfers
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) have jointly implemented a Regional Automated Fare Collection System (AFC) now called “Compass Card;” and

WHEREAS SANDAG currently has procured fare collection equipment for the AFC System through an existing contract with GFI Genfare, SANDAG Contract No. G0793.0-03 (GFI Contract); and

WHEREAS MTS now desires to procure additional equipment compatible with the existing AFC equipment procured through the GFI Contract; and

WHEREAS such compatible equipment is available only through GFI Genfare and therefore must be procured on a sole source basis; and

WHEREAS the parties mutually desire to facilitate such procurement through an amendment to the GFI Contract; NOW, THEREFORE,

IT IS AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. SANDAG shall execute one or more amendments to the GFI Contract as necessary for the purchase of additional AFC-compatible equipment on behalf of MTS (New AFC Equipment).

2. The scope of the New AFC Equipment shall be limited to that set forth in Exhibit “A” hereto at the prices set forth in such exhibit, but shall not necessarily include all line items set forth in such Exhibit. The total cost of the New AFC Equipment shall not exceed $340,000.

3. MTS shall communicate to SANDAG in writing the final scope of the New AFC Equipment, and shall concurrently transfer to SANDAG the total cost of the New AFC Equipment per the prices set forth in Exhibit “A.”

4. SANDAG shall act as project manager and contract manager for the duration of the GFI Contract amendments and shall perform the duties generally attributable to such roles including, but not limited to, monitoring scope, schedule, budget, and deliverables.

5. Upon final payment for the New AFC Equipment, MTS shall own such equipment.

6. MTS shall fully defend, indemnify, and hold harmless SANDAG, including all of its officers and employees, from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with this MOU.
7. SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify, and hold harmless MTS, including all of its officers and employees, from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by MTS under or in connection with this MOU.

8. The parties shall not assign this MOU without the prior written consent of the other two parties.

9. No alteration or variation of the terms of this MOU shall be valid unless made in writing and signed by MTS and SANDAG.

10. Notice shall be addressed as follows:

To MTS:
Attention: Chief Executive Officer
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101-7490

To SANDAG
Attention: Executive Director
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Copy to: SANDAG
Attention: Compass Program Manager
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

This MOU shall be effective this _________ day of May 2008.

METROPOLITAN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION
TRANSIT SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENTS

______________________________  ______________________________
Paul C. Jablonski              Gary L. Gallegos
Chief Executive Officer        Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________  ______________________________
Tiffany Lorenzen              Julie Wiley
Office of the General Counsel  Office of the General Counsel

APRIL28-08.32.AttA.FAREBOX MOU.EHURWITZ.doc

Attachment: Exhibit A
### Exhibit "A"

#### Proposed GFI Genfare Amendment 5 Equipment Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>Revenue Systems Installation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$925.00</td>
<td>$2,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>Support Computer Systems Installation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Revenue Collection Vault/Receivers (w/o mobile safe)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$31,300.00</td>
<td>$93,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>Mobile Safes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,585.00</td>
<td>$74,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>Garage Data Management System (CB/ID computer &amp; GFI garage data system hardware and software)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,150.00</td>
<td>$40,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>Data Probe Equipment (per lane)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,245.00</td>
<td>$28,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-foot Extension for Probes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$263,865.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sales Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,449.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMENDMENT 5 EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$284,314.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed GFI Genfare Amendment 5 Spare Parts Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D21133-0001</td>
<td>S/A Controller Board &quot;Logic Board&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22807-0004</td>
<td>S/A Power Board Converter DC/DC 12VDC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$386.00</td>
<td>$3,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23931-1928P</td>
<td>S/A Coin Validator &quot;No Tokens W/US Coins&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$321.00</td>
<td>$3,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23950-0001</td>
<td>S/A Bill Validator (BV-7)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$425.00</td>
<td>$6,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23698-0004</td>
<td>S/A Bill Transport &quot;New&quot; High Speed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$564.00</td>
<td>$5,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18631-0002</td>
<td>S/A Cashbox, Short with I/D (-2 Only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$595.00</td>
<td>$1,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22146-0002</td>
<td>S/A Electronic Lock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$490.00</td>
<td>$1,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22192-0001</td>
<td>S/A TRIM 2.0 for Odyssey Farebox complete</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,900.00</td>
<td>$8,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D122188-0002</td>
<td>S/A Printer - TRIM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,052.22</td>
<td>$1,052.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23903-0001</td>
<td>S/A Conveyor - TRIM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,509.09</td>
<td>$1,509.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiver Spare Parts Kit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$560.00</td>
<td>$560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Spare Parts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$42,066.31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sales Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,260.14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMENDMENT 5 SPARE PARTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$45,326.45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

- **Subtotal Equipment**: $284,314.54
- **Subtotal Spare Parts**: $45,326.45
- **Contingency**: $10,359.01

**TOTAL PROPOSED EQUIPMENT AND SPARE PARTS**: $340,000.00

Note: All equipment and spare parts shall be delivered to MTS c/o Veolia Transportation - South Bay Division, 3650A Main Street, Chula Vista, CA 91911
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Section 2(C)(3) of the TransNet Extension Ordinance states:

Smart Growth Incentive Program: An estimated $280 million will be allocated to the Smart Growth Incentive Program to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination. These funds shall be allocated on a regional competitive grant basis. It is intended that these funds be used to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented. The Commission shall establish specific project eligibility criteria for this program.

Funding for this program is identified in Section 4(D)(3) of the ordinance under Local Programs. It allocates 2.1 percent of the funds each year for this purpose. For FY 2009, SANDAG’s Finance Department is estimating that this will amount to approximately $5 million.

This report provides background information about the Smart Growth Incentive Program, and a status report on work underway to develop the program guidelines and project selection criteria for the program.

Discussion

In 2005, SANDAG approved the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (PSGIP), which was funded with $23.5 million from the federal Transportation Enhancements (TE) program. Utilizing a competitive grant process, the program allocated six years worth of TE funds to 14 projects around the region. Projects included streetscape enhancements, pedestrian improvements, traffic calming measures and enhancements to transit station areas in Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, and the City of San Diego. Developing the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGIP) has begun from the base of experience gained with the Pilot Program. The program’s development also has been informed by a review of the literature on smart growth, and by what we have been able to learn from similar programs conducted by other regional agencies in the state. In addition, we are taking into account the feedback we received on the program from the 2006 Independent Transit Planning Review report, and from the state Attorney General’s office in its comments on the Regional Transportation Plan.
To assist with the program development, SANDAG has assembled an ad hoc working group that includes representatives from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). Because the program has a focus on land use development as much as transportation project development, the TSGIP will be administered under the policy guidance of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). Earlier this year, the RPC identified the following policy objectives for the program:

- Fund projects that are “ready-to-go” to put good examples of smart growth development on the ground as catalysts for further development.
- The projects should influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private smart growth projects that, in combination, create great places.
- The projects should contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases by encouraging travel by means other than private automobile. In particular the projects should support public transit usage by being within areas served by transit, and by improving access to transit.
- The projects should support housing development at densities appropriate for its place type.
- The projects should provide good examples of smart growth in a variety of settings in the region.

**Preliminary Program Outline**

The ad hoc working group has developed recommendations on the basic program features, including the frequency of funding cycles and funding levels, project types, screening and eligibility criteria, project evaluation criteria, and the project evaluation process. The program details will continue to be refined over the next month as the recommendations are reviewed by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC).

**Funding Levels and Funding Cycles.** With an estimate of just $5 million available in the first year of the program, the working group is recommending that the program would have more impact if each call for projects combined two years of funding. This would make approximately $10.2 million available for the first funding cycle. The working group has also discussed putting a cap in individual grant amounts as a means of ensuring a minimum quantity of projects are selected in each cycle. This would provide an opportunity to fund a variety of projects in a variety of areas around the region. However, no agreement has been reached on what that cap should be, so the Regional Planning Committee will be asked to make a recommendation at its May meeting. Funding caps in the range of $1 million to $2 million have been discussed.

**Project Types.** The TransNet Ordinance authorizes expenditures for both capital improvements and planning projects. The RPC expressed a clear preference for “bricks and mortar” projects, so the working group is suggesting a program that focuses on capital improvements by capping grants for planning activities at ten percent of the available funding.

For capital projects, the working group is suggesting that the TSGIP fund the same type of public right-of-way improvements as the Pilot Program (streetscape enhancements like lighting and landscaping, bicycle and pedestrian access improvements, and transit access improvements, for
example), with some additions that take advantage of the flexibility in using local TransNet funds. This flexibility could make funding available for projects that create public spaces outside the transportation right of way such as public plazas and common neighborhood green space that are so important for creating quality environments in more intensely developed communities. Projects that encourage parking appropriate to smart growth areas could also be funded.

Proposed projects would have to be within one of the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas shown on SANDAG’s Smart Growth Concept Map. To focus the grants in areas where funding would have the greatest impact, the working group has developed an outline for the project selection criteria designed to identify the areas with existing regional investments in public transit, and with planned densities that are significant for the project’s place type.

**Next Steps**

The ad hoc working group will continue working to develop recommendations for the project selection criteria and selection process. As it develops consensus on the details of the program, SANDAG staff will be developing guidelines that will govern the administration of the program. The results of this work will be brought back to ITOC and the RPC in June for review and comment. A report on the program also will be made to the Transportation Committee for its information. Based on comments received through this review process, final draft program guidelines and project evaluation process will be prepared for the RPC’s consideration in the coming months at which time the RPC would be asked to recommend that the Board approve the guidelines and evaluation process and authorize SANDAG to issue the first call for projects. Once approved, the call for projects could be issued this summer, and a recommended list of projects for funding could ready for RPC consideration in the fall.

**BOB LEITER**  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Key Staff Contact:** Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
AMENDMENT TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
WITH THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL
SUPPORT TO THE SPRINTER RAIL PROJECT  File Number 1115200

Introduction

After the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 1703, SANDAG signed a Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the North County Transit District (NCTD) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) to define the functions and responsibilities of the agencies. Addendum 2 to this MOU was executed on June 16, 2005, providing reimbursement for SANDAG assistance on the NCTD SPRINTER rail project, not to exceed $275,000. The Addendum was amended by Board action on November 17, 2006, to provide an additional $1,225,000 of support. NCTD has requested a second amendment to provide another $250,000 of support for a total cost not to exceed $1,750,000.

Discussion

Since June 2005, SANDAG has provided assistance to NCTD with the construction of the SPRINTER. In November 2006 this assistance was increased to provide for additional staff and consultant support for the project as part of its Amended Recovery Plan. SANDAG staffing and consultant levels have fluctuated since that time. Currently we provide one full-time staff engineer, two full-time consultants, and part-time project oversight assistance.

Funds remaining from the previous amendments are inadequate to provide the necessary assistance through project close-out. NCTD is requesting additional support for stormwater compliance, configuration management; design assistance, local agency coordination, and overall project close-out. The value of this work is estimated to be $250,000 and would be provided on a reimbursed basis.

This amendment will increase the amount of SANDAG support from $1,500,000 to $1,750,000. With this action, the Transportation Committee will also be approving a $250,000 increase to the budget for the Capital Improvement Program project 1115200 (SANDAG Project Management Assistance) on the FY 2008 Program Budget.

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation
Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Understanding
Key Staff Contact: Jim Linthicum, (619) 699-1970, jlin@sandag.org
AMENDMENT 2 TO ADDENDUM 2  
TO THE MASTER MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS,  
THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT,  
AND THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
DEFINING THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES  
OF THE THREE AGENCIES:  
STAFF ASSISTANCE ON OCEANSIDE – ESCONDIDO (SPRINTER) PROJECT

This Amendment 2 to Addendum 2 is made and entered into this _____ day of May 2008, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) and the North County Transit District (“NCTD”).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, a Master Memorandum of Understanding between the San Diego Association of Governments, the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (now known as the North County Transit District), and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (now known as the Metropolitan Transit System) Defining the Functions and Responsibilities of the Three Agencies (“MOU”) was entered into by the parties in April 2004; and

WHEREAS, the MOU adopts and incorporates the “Transition Plan – Subsequent Transfer”, which outlines responsibilities for Development and Construction functions on capital projects for the three agencies; and

WHEREAS, the “Transition Plan – Subsequent Transfer” specifies that SANDAG may provide staff assistance on the SPRINTER project to NCTD; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG and NCTD (the parties) entered into Addendum 2 to the MOU in June 2005 to address staff assistance by SANDAG on the SPRINTER project; and

WHEREAS, NCTD is in need of additional project management engineering support and consulting services for the SPRINTER project; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has certain project management engineering staff and on-call engineering consultants that are or will become available; and

WHEREAS, the parties seek to append the MOU with this Amendment 2 to Addendum 2 to describe the manner in which SANDAG will provide additional staff assistance to NCTD on the SPRINTER project; and

IN CONSIDERATION of the mutual promises set forth herein, the Parties agree as follows:

This Amendment 2 shall supersede the provisions set forth in Addendum 2, and the first amendment thereto, to the extent set forth below. The parties shall remain bound to the terms of the MOU, Addendum 2 and Amendment 1 thereto except to the extent the terms of this Amendment 2 conflict with those documents in which case this Amendment 2 shall supersede.
Paragraphs 5 and 6 of Section III, entitled “SANDAG Staff Assistance,” shall be amended to instead read as follows:

5. SANDAG shall invoice NCTD monthly, on an hourly rate basis, for the SANDAG staff engineering support provided for that month. Such hourly rates shall be specific to each position type, will be disclosed to NCTD in advance, and may be amended as needed to ensure full cost recovery by SANDAG. SANDAG’s hourly rates for staff housed at NCTD shall exclude overhead items such as access to a vehicle at the work site, computers, office space, office supplies, and job-specific training required for the SPRINTER project assignments, which shall be directly provided by NCTD. SANDAG’s hourly rates shall include both salary and benefit costs for SANDAG employees. For SANDAG on-call engineering firms assigned to the SPRINTER project, SANDAG shall invoice NCTD monthly for reimbursement for the amounts so billed from the consultants. NCTD shall also reimburse SANDAG for any SPRINTER-project required travel in a SANDAG staff engineer’s vehicle (other than to and from work at the Field Office, unless otherwise arranged) at the approved IRS rate per mile, currently in effect at the time. NCTD shall approve and make prompt payment on all invoices sent by SANDAG or explain the reason for disapproval of any item in writing within twenty (20) days of receipt.

6. The amount of this Amendment shall be $250,000. The total cost to be reimbursed to SANDAG under this Amendment and all Addenda for SPRINTER engineering support shall not exceed $1,750,000 over the life of the SPRINTER project, unless subsequently amended by mutual agreement of NCTD and SANDAG.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Amendment 2 to Addendum 2 on the date and year first written above.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: C Michael Cowett
    General Counsel, Best Best & Krieger

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: Office of the General Counsel

NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD

By: Karen H. King, Executive Director

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

By: Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director
Introduction

The North County Transit District (NCTD) conducts three service changes annually. These service changes reflect current labor agreements and are based on providing the flexibility for NCTD to make needed changes as service demand changes throughout the year. NCTD is facing a major shortfall in revenue as a result of changes to the California State Budget and declining sales tax receipts. NCTD is proposing to discontinue 16 low-performing fixed-route services and all FAST services. In addition NCTD is proposing major schedule adjustments on other routes on weekends. The service eliminations are based on reviews of passenger counts from individual trips and by evaluating a route’s year-end performance productivity (boardings per service hour) with its peers.

One of the proposed service changes, as defined by SANDAG Board Policy No. 018, “Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation Policy,” involves a regionally significant service (Route 386). This policy requires that SANDAG conduct an analysis to determine whether the proposed change is consistent with SANDAG regional transportation and land use goals as incorporated into the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and Regional Short Range Transit Plan. An “Administrative Review of Service Consistency” or a “Finding of Overriding Considerations” is required before a route of regional significance can be changed. NCTD is in the process of conducting a Title VI analysis pursuant to federal regulations for transit agencies, and the results of that analysis is needed in order for the Transportation Committee to make its determination. Staff will report back its findings to the Transportation Committee at the May 16, 2008, meeting.

The discussion below summarizes the key proposed service changes.

Discussion

If the proposed fixed route service changes are made in August 2008, NCTD will realize a cost savings of approximately $4.7 million, and lose about 740,000 passengers and $740,000 in revenue. Eliminating FAST will save NCTD about $1.1 million in operating costs; however, some one-time shutdown costs are expected to reduce this savings to about $900,000 in FY 2009. SANDAG has reviewed the proposed eliminations for regional significance as required under Board Policy No. 018:

- Route 311/312 – These routes provides internal service within the West Oceanside community operating at 90-minute service frequency, with other routes in the general area. Conclusion: No regional significance.

- Route 324 – This local service between Carlsbad to Oceanside operates with 60-minute service frequency, and has other routes in the general area. Conclusion: No regional significance.
- Routes 338/339 – These route are circulators services within Vista, with other routes in general area. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Routes 341/442 – Route 341 provides hourly service between Palomar College and California State University (CSU) San Marcos; this corridor is served by SPRINTER. Route 442 is an hourly circulator within San Marcos, with other routes in general area. **Conclusion on both routes: No regional significance.**

- Route 347 – This local route operates between Escondido and San Marcos, with other routes in general area. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Route 348/349 – These two routes provide hourly circulator service within Escondido; other routes serve the general area. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Route 365 – This route is a circulator service within Encinitas; other routes serve the area. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- FAST Encinitas, FAST Vista, FAST Fallbrook – These routes provide demand-responsive service within these communities; there are other routes that serve the general area. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Route 386 – This route operates between Escondido and Ramona; the proposal is to eliminate service east of the Wild Animal Park. Since there are no other NCTD services in Ramona, this proposal would effectively eliminate fixed-route and ADA service access between Ramona and the Escondido/NCTD area; the only service option is the very limited Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) rural service that connects Ramona south to El Cajon on a twice weekly schedule. **Conclusion: This route does have regional significance since it is the only NCTD service to a major geographic area (Ramona).**

  The Title VI analysis being conducted by NCTD will assess the impact of the proposed service change to riders. This analysis then will be used along with other information for the Transportation Committee to make a finding pursuant to SANDAG Board Policy No. 018 as noted earlier.

- Route 397 – This local route operates between Oceanside and Fallbrook via Camp Pendleton. While it would eliminate service to Camp Pendleton from Oceanside, there are other routes that would still serve Camp Pendleton (Route 315) and Fallbrook (Route 306). **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Routes 403 and 415 – These local routes provide limited peak service in Oceanside; other routes serve the same corridor. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

- Route 447 – This local route operates limited peak service between Palomar College and CSU San Marcos; other services are available. **Conclusion: No regional significance.**

---

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment:  1. Transit Service Changes

Key Staff Contact:  Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
## POSSIBLE BREEZE/SPRINTER SERVICE REDUCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Savings</th>
<th>Fare Revenue</th>
<th>Net Annual</th>
<th>Annual Lost</th>
<th>Subsidy Saved</th>
<th>Est Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est Annual</td>
<td>Annual Lost</td>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Per Pass. Lost</td>
<td>(Pass./Rev Hr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce Saturday Levels on BREEZE to Sunday/Holiday Levels</td>
<td>327,983</td>
<td>(38,584)</td>
<td>289,399</td>
<td>(38,584)</td>
<td>(7.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 301</td>
<td>16,666</td>
<td>(1,144)</td>
<td>15,522</td>
<td>(1,144)</td>
<td>(11.86)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 302</td>
<td>14,716</td>
<td>(1,144)</td>
<td>13,572</td>
<td>(1,144)</td>
<td>(11.86)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 309</td>
<td>164,157</td>
<td>(18,564)</td>
<td>145,593</td>
<td>(18,564)</td>
<td>(7.84)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 313</td>
<td>22,074</td>
<td>(1,976)</td>
<td>20,098</td>
<td>(1,976)</td>
<td>(10.17)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 350</td>
<td>18,836</td>
<td>(5,096)</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>(5,096)</td>
<td>(10.17)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 351/352</td>
<td>47,606</td>
<td>(3,900)</td>
<td>43,706</td>
<td>(3,900)</td>
<td>(11.21)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 354</td>
<td>14,532</td>
<td>(2,496)</td>
<td>12,036</td>
<td>(2,496)</td>
<td>(4.82)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 356</td>
<td>18,395</td>
<td>(3,068)</td>
<td>15,327</td>
<td>(3,068)</td>
<td>(5.00)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 358/359</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>(1,040)</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>(1,040)</td>
<td>(9.58)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Eliminate Saturday Service on BREEZE</td>
<td>608,396</td>
<td>(66,167)</td>
<td>542,230</td>
<td>(66,167)</td>
<td>(8.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 304/404</td>
<td>107,059</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>94,059</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>(7.24)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 311/312</td>
<td>38,262</td>
<td>(4,212)</td>
<td>34,050</td>
<td>(4,212)</td>
<td>(8.08)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 313</td>
<td>54,523</td>
<td>(5,287)</td>
<td>49,236</td>
<td>(5,287)</td>
<td>(9.31)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 321</td>
<td>43,523</td>
<td>(5,486)</td>
<td>38,037</td>
<td>(5,486)</td>
<td>(9.90)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 324</td>
<td>108,273</td>
<td>(7,878)</td>
<td>100,395</td>
<td>(7,878)</td>
<td>(12.74)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 334/335</td>
<td>35,797</td>
<td>(3,926)</td>
<td>31,871</td>
<td>(3,926)</td>
<td>(8.12)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 341</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>(5,683)</td>
<td>48,877</td>
<td>(5,683)</td>
<td>(8.31)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 347</td>
<td>36,128</td>
<td>(5,486)</td>
<td>30,642</td>
<td>(5,486)</td>
<td>(9.90)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 348/349</td>
<td>39,181</td>
<td>(3,835)</td>
<td>35,346</td>
<td>(3,835)</td>
<td>(9.22)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 365</td>
<td>51,065</td>
<td>(6,583)</td>
<td>44,481</td>
<td>(6,583)</td>
<td>(7.66)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Route 366 - Discontinue Service East of Wild Animal Park to Ramona</td>
<td>180,413</td>
<td>(21,165)</td>
<td>159,248</td>
<td>(21,165)</td>
<td>(7.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Wild Animal Park improved to Every 60-Minutes</td>
<td>180,413</td>
<td>(21,165)</td>
<td>159,248</td>
<td>(21,165)</td>
<td>(7.52)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Savings from not Operating East of Wild Animal Park to Ramona</td>
<td>42,980</td>
<td>(4,912)</td>
<td>38,068</td>
<td>(1,228)</td>
<td>(31.00)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Route 313 (Oceanside) - Eliminate Sat/Sun/Hol Service</td>
<td>135,260</td>
<td>(28,677)</td>
<td>106,583</td>
<td>(28,677)</td>
<td>(3.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Route 325 (Carlsbad/Oceanside) - Eliminate Sat/Sun/Hol Service</td>
<td>275,501</td>
<td>(42,622)</td>
<td>232,879</td>
<td>(42,622)</td>
<td>(5.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Route 365 (Encinitas) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>267,371</td>
<td>(34,170)</td>
<td>233,201</td>
<td>(34,170)</td>
<td>(6.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Route 397 (Camp Pendleton/Fallbrook) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>284,891</td>
<td>(36,210)</td>
<td>248,681</td>
<td>(36,210)</td>
<td>(8.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Route 341/442 (San Marcos) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>532,578</td>
<td>(86,445)</td>
<td>446,133</td>
<td>(86,445)</td>
<td>(5.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Route 358/359 (Escondido) - Eliminate Sat/Sun/Hol Service</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td>(13,676)</td>
<td>69,830</td>
<td>(13,676)</td>
<td>(5.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Route 365 (Carlsbad/Oceanside) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>267,552</td>
<td>(45,380)</td>
<td>222,172</td>
<td>(45,380)</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Route 348/349 (Escondido) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>257,773</td>
<td>(43,860)</td>
<td>206,913</td>
<td>(43,860)</td>
<td>(4.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Route 347 (Escondido/San Marcos) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>518,686</td>
<td>(93,075)</td>
<td>425,611</td>
<td>(93,075)</td>
<td>(4.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Route 311/312 (Oceanside) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>259,794</td>
<td>(44,064)</td>
<td>215,730</td>
<td>(44,064)</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Route 338/339 (Vista) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>257,990</td>
<td>(43,758)</td>
<td>214,232</td>
<td>(43,758)</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Route 415 (Oceanside) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>72,165</td>
<td>(3,750)</td>
<td>68,595</td>
<td>(3,750)</td>
<td>(19.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Route 447 (San Marcos) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>72,165</td>
<td>(3,750)</td>
<td>68,595</td>
<td>(3,750)</td>
<td>(17.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Route 311 (San Marcos) - Discontinue Route</td>
<td>216,495</td>
<td>(78,000)</td>
<td>138,495</td>
<td>(78,000)</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Route 351 (Escondido) - Reduce Sat/Sun/Hol Frequency to Every 60-Minutes</td>
<td>71,443</td>
<td>(13,228)</td>
<td>58,216</td>
<td>(13,228)</td>
<td>(4.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Route 352 (Escondido) - Reduce Sat/Sun/Hol Frequency to Every 60-Minutes</td>
<td>75,724</td>
<td>(15,192)</td>
<td>60,532</td>
<td>(15,192)</td>
<td>(3.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guest Commentary
By Jim Schmidt

Regents Road completion will reduce traffic congestion on I-5, I-805, Genesee

The long-planned Regents Road Bridge, aka the Congestion Relief Bridge, between University City and UTC has been a part of the Community Plan for many years. The bridge will rest high above Rose Canyon, where 50 passenger trains a day, freight trains at night and many bicyclists go through it. Page 1228 of the Thomas Guide illustrates the fact that the missing connection link of Regents Road is real. The planned connection of a Governor Drive direct link to Interstate 5 and Gilman Drive was deleted, which makes the Regents Road connection — to relieve the heavy traffic congestion on Genesee Avenue and interstates 805 and 5 — even more important.

NIMBYs (Not In My Backyard) are trying to prevail against the bridge by stirring up opponents who are going all out to stop the completion of this crucial transportation link. This is really a TIMBY issue (Yes In My Backyard), since the backyard is the entire San Diego region. When local road connections work well, fewer drivers use freeways and instead take local roads and streets. The bridge will help all freeway drivers; this is especially true when heavily traveled I-5 and I-805, which include traffic to and from Mexico, are right next door.

An example of local roads relieving freeway congestion is the East County situation where the area has six major local parallel streets/roads: Mission Gorge Road; Broadway in El Cajon, which becomes Fletcher Parkway; El Cajon Boulevard; University; Market; and Imperial — all with at least two lanes each way. The use of those local roads keeps many drivers off the east-west freeways, helping them function much more effectively than the freeways to the north.

In observing the area, a key benefit of the Regents Road connection will be its link to state Route 52 to the south, diverting some of the traffic from congested Genesee Avenue. SR 52 runs on the floor of San Clemente Canyon. Drivers traveling west on SR 52 can connect to I-5 or La Jolla or go east to connect to I-805 and I-15, and farther to the east as well. Regents Road then continues south to Clairemont and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. The result will provide drivers with different options to connect to the south from the UTC area by using Regents Road and Genesee Avenue.

I have observed the very heavy "crawl" congestion going south on Genesee from UTC at 5:30 p.m. on a weekday. Genesee also needs to be widened to alleviate traffic congestion. However, the construction to widen Genesee cannot occur before the alternate Regents Road is completed.

Another reason why the Regents Road connection is necessary is because of the scary public safety situation. The Fire Rescue Department of the city of San Diego needs quick access available for the first alarm response. Former Fire Chief Jeff Bowman supported the Regents Road Bridge. Envision this scenario: A man has a heart attack and access is needed to his area. Will he die if the response time is slow because of where he lives in the UTC/University City area? Also, what about fires? Remember the Cedar Fire?

It is easy to see why the Regents Road Bridge project is in University City's Community Plan. If you can run a road down through San Clemente Canyon, why can't you run a road on a bridge up and over Rose Canyon, which provides more environmental protection? Also worth noting is that developers in the UTC area paid into FBA funds for infrastructure, such as the bridge, to accommodate their development projects, and the average daily trip increases because of such projects. Northern areas of San Diego already have become more congested with the loss of the Camino Ruiz extension to Penasquitos and the failure to reopen the temporary closing of a short span of Sorrento Valley Road to build the state Route 56 connection to I-5.

Since the Regents Road Bridge is a regional project, it is understandable why the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce took a position. The issue came before four chamber committees (Transportation, Public Policy, Housing and Infrastructure, and Special Projects Committee). The members of all four committees voted to support the project with only four abstentions and zero "no" votes. After a big meeting with both proponents and opponents of the Regents Road Bridge, the chamber's full Regional Board of Directors then voted unanimously, with no abstentions, to support the construction of the bridge and also approve the badly needed widening of Genesee Avenue.

The issue will be before City Council very soon. I urge the council to think regionally and what is best for drivers and residents of the entire city, other cities and the county. What is best is to approve the Regents Road project, ignore the NIMBY opposition and go TIMBY because the entire San Diego region is our backyard. I strongly urge the City Council to approve both the Regents Road Bridge and the important widening of Genesee.

Schmidt is a retired banker and attorney and served in 3 positions in state government as Ronald Reagan's appointee. He is currently active in civic organizations and transportation, housing and sports. He serves on four public boards, one elected and three appointed. Send comments to editor@esd1.com. All letters are forwarded to the author and may be published as Letters to the Editor.
Good morning Chair Madaffer, Vice-Chair Dale, board members, staff, and other fellow citizens. Chuck Lungerhausen of 5308 Monroe Ave.#124 which is in the SDSU neighborhood of San Diego, 92115 Phone 619-546-5610.

Transit corridors is the key to making or transportation system work best. When most of us found a place to live that two word phrase was not important but with gas approaching $4.00 a gallon things do change.
Automated Fare Collection (AFC)
Recommendations

1. Authorize the Executive Director to execute the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MTS for SANDAG procurement of fareboxes in substantially the same form as attached.

2. Approve the associated budget increase of $340,000 for the Automated Fare Collection System Project #1145700.
SPRINTER MOU Amendment

- Current MOU provides for reimbursement up to $1.5M for SANDAG staff and consultant support

- Proposed amendment adds $250,000 for continued support thru close-out

- NCTD approval on April 17
Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment 2 to Addendum 2 to the master MOU with NCTD in substantially the same form as attached to Agenda Item 5, and take all other actions necessary to implement its provisions.